

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

The Fair Race's Darkest Hour


edited by

César Tort

Printed in the US

First printing: May 29, 2014

Softcover ISBN: 978-1-291-89671-8



“That the beauty of the white Aryan woman shall not perish from the Earth.”

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgement is due to the following authors and commenters (*italics* refer to websites): F. Roger Devlin, Arthur Kemp, Hajo Liaucius, Kevin MacDonald, Larry Mars, Michael O'Meara, Jason Richwine, Manu Rodríguez, Sebastian E. Ronin, Franklin Ryckaert, J.A. Sexton, *Evropa Soberana*, *Stormfront*, Vance Stubbs, Tomislav Sunic, Jared Taylor and Joseph Walsh.

Preface

Together with other pro-Aryan forums and webzines, recently my blogsite *The West's Darkest Hour* became inaccessible from the public libraries of the United States. With all probability, what remains of the First Amendment in that country will finally die; and let us not talk about the so-called “hate-speech” laws throughout the countries of Western Europe that do not even hold remnants of first amendments. We are entitled to fear that in the near future our forums will be censored not only at public places but in our homes as well.

It is high time, therefore, to save in printed form the most didactic pieces of the more than a thousand entries I have added to *The West's Darkest Hour* since 2008. This book collects the *crème de la crème* of what I have read in both the printed press and online about the subject of White preservation. Except several short, elucidating notes, in this collection I have omitted my more personal, longer essays. (Those essays will appear under another cover, perhaps with the title *Day of Wrath*.)

Precisely because this book, *The Fair Race's Darkest Hour*, is a prophylactic measure against the coming axing of the internet, it does not include some subjects discussed in my blogsite. I refer to the coming collapse of the dollar and, later in this century, an apocalyptic energy devolution that will open a big window of opportunity for Whites to wake up. Since both subjects are completely unrelated to racial matters the websites that explain them will probably survive the coming censorship. I would recommend those who are about to save in their hard-disks the *PDF* of this book, available at the top of *The West's Darkest Hour*—or who will purchase hard copies of it as gifts for their friends and families—, to take the free audiovisual courses on the coming currency crash by Mike Maloney and the explanation of peak-oil by Chris Martenson. Both courses represent vital, complementary knowledge of the collection in the present book.

I chose the title of a “darkest hour” because what I treasure the most is Aryan female beauty; and unless Whites awaken from what the late Dominique Veneer called “Europe’s dormition” the fairest creatures on Earth will face eventual extinction.

The Aryans with honor that want to protect their women must acquire a Homeland of their own: a place where children can be born and raised in safety. A place where the

numbers of the population that represents the crown of the evolution may be restored and the threat of extinction overcome.

Terre et Peuple, Blut und Boden

César Tort
20 April, 2014

Contents

Our fourteen words 3

Acknowledgements 4

Preface 5

The Fair Race's Darkest Hour

Europe in dormition 13

Our first commandments 15

Brief manifesto 16

Part I The fundamentals of the new paradigm

Beware of the Newspeak

 The term “anti-racism” 20

 The epithet “hate” 22

 The word “racism” 24

Race realism

 Why can't we talk about IQ? 28

 The color of crime 34

 The roots of civilization 36

The Jewish problem

 Seeing the forest 42

 The saga of the European Jewry 49

 Kevin MacDonald's trilogy 57

On the need to undemonize Hitler

- The Holocaust perpetrated by Jew-led Bolsheviks 61
- Red terror—a Jewish terror? 63
- On Hitler 69
- Hellstorm: the Death of Nazi Germany 71

Part II The United States

- On Yockey's America 81
- Heidegger on Americanism 88
- Homo Americanus 93

Part III Christian axiology

The Christian problem - I

- Hitler on Christianity 107
- Is Christianity redeemable? 113
- Schweitzer's niglets 115

The Christian problem - II

- Wuthering Heights 119
- The historical demise of Christianity 121
- The Judeo-Christian axiom 140

The Christian problem - III

- Succedaneous religion 144
- Letter from Manu 150
- Zeus must replace Yahweh 152

The Christian problem - IV

- The Roman legacy 159
- Julian on Christianity 163
- Kriminalgeschichte des Christentums* 167
- Colhaze's missing article 177

Part IV The Aryan problem: Economics over race

Gold over blood

- Heroic materialism 182
- The enemy of Europe 185
- The next conservatism? 186
- The One Ring 191
- Liberalism 194

Toward a meta-perspective of the white race

- Our long, long history 206
- A witches' brew 301

Part V The Aryan problem: Ethno-suicide

Formal texts

- Three texts 306
- Race and religion 313
- A haunting novel 325
- Mugged by reality 331
- Titans* passages 338
- Alexander the “great” 351
- White pathology 355

Informal texts

- Ryckaert *et al* 369
- E-mail exchange 382

Part VI Why I gave up white nationalism

A lone voice

- An overly traveled road to extinction 391

White nationalists and the sexual revolution

- On homosexual “marriage” 407

Our most sacred institution 413
Nietzsche on marriage 415
Sexual utopia in power 417

White nationalists' amnesty to non-whites - I

Portugal and the one-drop rule 448
Who is really "white" or "Aryan"? 458
Were the Greeks blond and blue-eyed? 461

White nationalists' amnesty to non-whites - II

Were the Romans blond and blue-eyed? 471
Italian mudbloods 482
Stubbs responds 484
AA approach to the one-drop rule 488

Are white nationalists real men?

Thus spake Zarathustra 491
Rockwell, Pierce, Hitler 492
Sparta and its law 496

Part VII NS replaces white nationalism

For the Hitler Youth 590
Rockwell: A NS life 592
National Socialist worldview 620
Letter from Manu 630
Why I am not a neonazi 633


Parting word

Mars and Hephaestus 643
Ex gladio libertas 645

The fair race's darkest hour

Europe in dormition

by Dominique Venner (1935-2013)



Since the end of the two World Wars and their orgy of violence, Europe “entered into dormition.” Europeans do not know it. Everything is done to conceal this fact. But this state of “dormition” continues to weigh us down. Every day, European impotence is clear.

The state of “dormition” is the consequence of the catastrophic excesses of the murderous, fratricidal frenzy perpetrated between 1914 and 1945. It was also the gift of the US and USSR, the two hegemonic powers resulting from the Second World War. These powers imposed their systems, which were foreign to our intellectual, social, and political tradition. Although one has since disappeared, the toxic effects are still felt. We are, moreover, wallowing in a guilt without equivalent. According to the eloquent word of Elie Barnavi, “The Shoah has risen to the rank of civil religion in the West.”

But history is never motionless. Those who reach the summit of power are condemned to go down again.

It bears repeating, moreover, that power is not everything. Power is necessary to exist in the world, to be free for one’s destiny, to escape subjection to political, economic, ideological, or criminal empires. But power is not immune to the maladies of the soul capable of destroying nations and empires.

Although threatened by many quite real dangers and ever sharper conflicts of interests and intentions, Europeans today are first and foremost victims of these diseases of the soul. Unlike other peoples and civilizations, Europeans are deprived of all self-awareness. It is the decisive cause of their weakness. If you believe their leaders, they are without past, roots, destiny. They are nothing. And yet what they share is unique. They are privileged with the memory and the models of a great civilization attested since Homer and his founding poems.

The many heavy trials on the horizon, the weakening of the powers that dominated us for so long, the upheavals of a henceforth unstable world, indicate that Europe's "dormition" will not be eternal.

Excerpted from "L'Europe en dormition," July 2010.

Editor's note:

On May 21, 2013 Venner committed suicide by firearm in the cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris. He had been an opponent of Muslim immigration to France and Europe, the Americanization of European mores and the legalization of homosexual "marriage" in France.

Only hours earlier, he had left a post on his blog where Venner rebukes the so-called dissidents for ignoring the threat of Afro-Maghreb immigration, which he predicts will lead to a "total replacement of the population of France and of Europe." He warns, "Peaceful street protests will not be enough to prevent it... It will require new, spectacular, and symbolic actions to rouse people from their complacency... We enter into a time when words must be backed up by actions."

In a letter sent to his colleagues he characterizes his suicide as a rebellion "against pervasive individual desires that destroy the anchors of our identity, particularly the family, the intimate base of our multi-millennial society." He explains his decision to commit suicide inside the cathedral: "I chose a highly symbolic place that I respect and admire."

Shortly after his death was reported, nationalist personalities across the country paid tribute to Venner and honored his public suicide. Marine Le Pen issued a tweet: "All our respect to Dominique Venner, whose final gesture, eminently political, was to try to awaken the people of France."

Our first commandments

by Joseph Walsh

The ethnostate must teach that the highest form of Wisdom consists in keeping one's blood pure. The first commandment of the new law-table is "Thou shalt keep thy blood pure." Another commandment must dictate the necessity of not enslaving non-whites.

Brief manifesto

“Equality is a slogan based on envy”
—Alexis de Tocqueville

1

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that men and cultures are created un-equal.

All men are unequal—nowhere in the natural world (and Man is part of Nature) is anything equal. Equality does not exist in Nature; equality only exists in the abstract world of mathematics and in the minds of delusional whites.

2

Only an ethno-state will save the fairest race from extinction.

Why extinction? Because both Nordic and Mediterranean whites are a threatened species due to the genocidal levels of immigration—a wholesale white European, American and Australian population replacement for non-whites.

3

The etiology of the darkest hour: Our entire civilization is under the grip of a Judeo-liberal ideology: the belief that non-discrimination on race and gender is the highest value of society. This ideology, that some call “political correctness,” has been imposed throughout the West after the Second World War.

4

Our forecast: The 21st century will be the darkest midnight for the fair race. After the crash of the dollar, and, still later in this century, the peak oil crisis, whites either gain a sense of themselves or they are going extinct.

5

The solution: Only complete sovereignty, complete safety through autonomy, complete self-determination brought about by secession and/or the expulsion of non-whites from what used to be all-white lands, will save the fair race.

Part I

The fundamentals of the new paradigm

Beware of the Newspeak

The word “racism” is a control word for whites: a thoughtcrime virus for the Aryan mind.

The term “Anti-racism”

by Robert Whitaker

Africa for the Africans, Asia for the Asians, Mexico for the Mexicans, White countries... for everybody.

Whenever you hear the words “social injustice,” “prejudice” or “inequality” substitute these with the words “white culture.” People who want to eliminate “social injustice,” “prejudice” or “inequality” really want to eliminate white culture.

Whenever you hear the words “white privilege,” substitute these with the words “white civilization.” People who want to eliminate “white privilege” really want to eliminate white civilization.

Whenever you hear the words “racist” or “racism” substitute these with the words “white person.” People who want to end the existence of “racists” and “racism” really want to end the existence of white people.

The anti-racists *say* they are against white racists, white racism, and white privilege. What they are *really* against is white culture, white civilization, and white people.

They *say* they want a world without “hate,” without “racism.” What they *really* want is a world without white people, a world without *you*.

When non-Whites pursue their group interests it’s called “civil rights.” When Jews pursue their group interests it’s called “lobbying.” When Whites pursue their interests it’s called “White Supremacy.”

Anti-racism is a *codeword* for anti-White.

The Mantra (“Anti-racism is a *codeword* for anti-White”) is a repeated message composed by the activist Robert Whitaker, intended to counter double standards, discrimination and negative bias towards white people and white societies.

The epithet “hate”

by Peter Anthony

In an age where perception equals reality, the enemies of our race have thrived on their portrayal of our cause as one of “hate” and “intolerance” for far too long.

Knowing the natural propensity of humans to gravitate toward the positive rather than the negative, our enemies, in this topsy-turvy world, have succeeded in calling the good bad and the bad good, and have achieved a monumental propaganda victory by getting the vast majority of the public to believe it.

By simply stepping forward (through their control of the media, churches, and other outlets) and declaring what is moral and what is immoral for all the world to hear, they have seized the moral high-ground on all societal issues, especially those dealing with race and culture; consequentially all those who wish to be moral will seek to obey what has been dictated from on high, not knowing or suspecting that the source of that information could be flawed or motivated by something other than goodwill.

Unfortunately, most people have not developed the adequate hindsight necessary to understand how today’s morality has changed from that of history; that indeed most of the famous people of history, from Plato to Thomas Jefferson, would be considered far from moral by today’s societal standards.

There can be no greater morality than that of the survival of the white race, and yet this is the first age where those who espouse this viewpoint are widely viewed as evil and immoral—haters. Seventy years ago, a politician had a hard time getting elected in the South without Klan support. When the Klan marched, they marched in broad daylight down the streets of major cities to the cheers of an adoring public. At a rally today, fifty or so Klansmen need police protection from the hundreds and thousands of jeering fools. While this has much to do with the declining state of the overall quality of our movement, it also reflects the sheer magnitude of the change in societal values.

The white races, more than any other, historically have been the creators, the developers, and the sustainers of civilization, of culture as we knew it when, across Europe, vast

cathedrals pierced the sky over great cities where white men and women carried out the struggle of their daily lives by striving to make them better through innovation, invention, and plain hard work.

In short they built a world, from the ground up, using nothing but their minds and their work hardened hands. They spread from sea to sea, then across the sea and back again. When Magellan circled the earth and Cortés conquered the Aztecs with a handful against thousands, while Gutenberg was inventing movable type so the Bible could be read by millions—others were ensconced in the same primitive, aboriginal state of life which existed thousands of years before.

The truth is not hatred, but the truth. In an age when chivalry was the norm, when behemoth castles dotted beautiful countrysides brimming with bountiful harvest, nothing was more sacred than honor—nothing more priceless than to be counted among the Godly. Today—we have lost our very souls. Today we are shadows of the men we once were. Instead of going West, we go to the nearest Blockbuster and watch a movie about it starring some Jew.

Am I called a hater for loving my family more than the family of another? If I prefer my wife over another, does this mean I hate all other women? And yet this is the logic our enemies often use when they accuse us of hatred for loving or preferring our racial family more than another.

The enemy has taken this noblest of all ideals, that of the preservation of God’s creation, and turned it into something twisted and evil. They have taken what is perfectly natural and right, the innate propensity of people to prefer their racial kindred, and called it “hatred” and “bigotry.”

There is nothing wrong with hatred, if properly placed, but on the whole our movement is not and never has been about hatred. It is about building a new society based on the natural and historic order of things.

The above piece was excerpted from “The Morality of Hatred,” an undated piece of “Our List of Selections” of the forum *Stormfront*.

Interim report

The word “racism”

The critique of language is the most radical of all critiques. If we don't uproot from our vocabulary the Newspeak of the anti-Western societies—keep in mind that when all great European civilizations were at their apex the word “racism” did not exist—, we won't even be able to start discussing the issues. More specifically, as long as “racism” is seen as the ultimate evil, to challenge this nonsensical view the white individual should awaken to the fact that races are real biological entities, displaying real physical and mental differences. To awake the white person from the illusions surrounding the word “racism” it is imperative to do a critique of—:

The Newspeak in today's West

Some linguists have argued that language is rhetoric, and that humans commit a fatal mistake in believing that, if a group of people use a word in all seriousness, it means that something real exists behind it.

“Newspeak” is propagandistic language characterized by neologism, euphemism, circumlocution, and the inversion of customary meanings. According to anti-Bolshevist George Orwell, the objective of Newspeak is social control. While Orwell's focus was a hard totalitarian dystopia, presently the word “racism” is ubiquitously used in soft totalitarian societies.

Let us refer to an ideology that, in contrast to Bolshevism, triumphed and imposed its Newspeak for centuries.

The fourth century of the Common Era, during the reign of Theodosius, witnessed the consolidation of power of the bishops in the Roman Empire after the premature death of Julian the Apostate. Those unconverted to the new religion, that in the times of Julian enjoyed special protection, became second-class citizens. A new word was coined, “pagan” to label the adept of the millenarian Hellenic culture. Once created the Newspeak those stigmatized as “pagans”—and especially the “heretics”—were persecuted more

zealously than the “pagan” persecutions of Christians in times of Decius and Diocletian. Only by these means the new theocracy succeed in brainwashing all westerners.

A virus for the white mind

The Roman Empire collapsed after the creation of this Newspeak. But as we shall see later in this book, some thinkers and pan-Germanic politicians have noted that Christianity was only the Bolshevism of the ancient world.

In the century when we were born, although white nationalists commonly attribute the term *racism* to Leon Trotsky, according to Immanuel Geiss the pejorative use of the term by the Left originated in Germany in the 1920s as criticism of National Socialism. The next decade the term “racism” reappeared in an American anti-fascist pamphlet, and the ethno-suicidal meme spread out like wildfire among unsuspecting whites.

If we translate the term back to Oldspeak—just as “pagan” only really meant the usual adept of classical culture—we will see that “racism” is a code word for “pro-white.” Alas, it has become a term that inadvertently induces guilt feelings within the white psyche: an artificial complex imposed upon the absolutely normal ethnic interests of the Aryan.

Detecting this psyop, the epithet “racist” together with the many other epithets, is priority number one in the process of de-brainwashing whites. Besides the most obvious words (“Islamophobe,” “xenophobe,” “homophobe,” etc.), below appears a short sample of Newspeak terms translated back to Oldspeak:

“Affirmative action” – Blacks stealing our jobs.

“Anti-Semitism” – The belief by gentiles that Jews may be criticized like any other group.

“Civil rights” – Untermenschen and spoiled white women have more rights than Übermenschen in the New World Order.

“Diversified workforce” – Much fewer white males are to be hired or promoted.

“Disadvantaged” – Unqualified and can’t speak English or French, so give them money.

“Equal treatment and opportunity” – Fewer opportunities for white people.

“Historic grievances” – White people ended slavery, human sacrifice in the American continent and cannibalism in tribal societies.

“Homophobia / gay bashing” – The healthy revulsion by Lot for Sodomite or Gomorrahite behavior.

“Human Rights Commissions” – Inquisitions denying free speech. Thought Police that enforces liberal political doctrine.

“Immigration” – Race replacement. Genocidal levels of immigration.

“Interracial relationship” – White women having non-white babies. Also called racial engineering or soft genocide of white people.

“Misogynist” – Anyone who disagrees with the racially-suicidal empowerment of the feminists.

“Multicultural enhancement” – Destroy all European cultures.

“Politically correct” – Fines and/or jail for anybody not liberal and following the New World Order.

“Respect and tolerance” – Surrender. “Tolerance” for millions of immigrants means demographic genocide for whites.

“Woman’s choice” – Abortion and genocide of millions of white babies.

Be warned! The first step that a dissident of the anti-white regime should take is to reject the System’s Newspeak, the words that anesthetize our understanding and debase our self-image.

Race realism

The worst form of inequality is to
try to make unequal things equal.

—Aristotle

Why can't we talk about IQ?

by Jason Richwine

"IQ is a metric of such dubiousness that almost no serious educational researcher uses it anymore," the *Guardian's* Ana Marie Cox wrote back in May. It was a breathtakingly ignorant statement. Psychologist Jelte Wicherts noted in response that a search for "IQ test" in Google's academic database yielded more than 10,000 hits—just for the year 2013.

But Cox's assertion is all too common. There is a large discrepancy between what educated laypeople believe about cognitive science and what experts actually know. Journalists are steeped in the lay wisdom, so they are repeatedly surprised when someone forthrightly discusses the real science of mental ability.

If that science happens to deal with group differences in average IQ, the journalists' surprise turns into shock and disdain. Experts who speak publicly about IQ differences end up portrayed as weird contrarians at best, and peddlers of racist pseudoscience at worst.

I'm speaking from experience. My Harvard Ph.D. dissertation contains some scientifically unremarkable statements about ethnic differences in average IQ, including the IQ difference between Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites. For four years, the dissertation did what almost every other dissertation does—collected dust in the university library. But when it was unearthed in the midst of the immigration debate, I experienced the vilification firsthand.

For people who have studied mental ability, what's truly frustrating is the *déjà vu* they feel each time a media firestorm like this one erupts. Attempts by experts in the field to defend the embattled messenger inevitably fall on deaf ears. When the firestorm is over, the media's mindset always resets to a state of comfortable ignorance, ready to be shocked all over again when the next messenger comes along.

At stake here, incidentally, is not just knowledge for the sake of knowledge, but also how science informs public policy. The U.S. education system, for example, is suffused with mental testing, yet few in the political classes understand cognitive ability research. Angry and repeated condemnations of the science will not help.

What scholars of mental ability know, but have never successfully gotten the media to understand, is that a scientific consensus, based on an extensive and consistent literature, has long been reached on many of the questions that still seem controversial to journalists.

For example, virtually all psychologists believe there is a general mental ability factor (referred to colloquially as “intelligence”) that explains much of an individual’s performance on cognitive tests. IQ tests approximately measure this general factor. Psychologists recognize that a person’s IQ score, which is influenced by both genetic and environmental factors, usually remains stable upon reaching adolescence. And they know that IQ scores are correlated with educational attainment, income, and many other socioeconomic outcomes.

In terms of group differences, people of northeast Asian descent have higher average IQ scores than people of European lineage, who in turn have higher average scores than people of sub-Saharan African descent. The average score for Hispanic Americans falls somewhere between the white and black American averages. Psychologists have tested and long rejected the notion that score differences can be explained simply by biased test questions. It is possible that genetic factors could influence IQ differences among ethnic groups, but many scientists are withholding judgment until DNA studies are able to link specific gene combinations with IQ.

How can I be sure all of this reflects mainstream thinking? Because, over the years, psychologists have put together statements, reports, and even books aimed at synthesizing expert opinion on IQ. Many of these efforts were made in explicit response to the periodic media firestorms that engulfed people who spoke publicly about cognitive science. It’s worth reviewing some of those incidents and detailing the scholarly responses—responses that are invariably forgotten before the next furor begins. I’ll place my own experience in that context.

Let’s start 25 years ago¹, with the publication of *The IQ Controversy*, a book by Mark Snyderman and Stanley Rothman. The authors surveyed more than 1,000 experts in the field of cognitive science to develop a picture of what the mainstream really looks like. It was very similar to the description I’ve supplied above.

Snyderman and Rothman systematically analyzed television, newspaper, and magazine coverage of IQ issues. They were alarmed to find that the media were presenting a much different picture than what the expert survey showed. Based on media portrayals, it would seem that most experts think IQ scores have little meaning, that genes have no influence on IQ, and that the tests are hopelessly biased. “Our work demonstrates that, by any

¹ Editor’s note: this article was published on August 9, 2013

reasonable standard, media coverage of the IQ controversy has been quite inaccurate,” the authors concluded.

In conducting the expert survey and contrasting the results with media depictions of IQ research, one would think Snyderman and Rothman had performed a valuable service. Surely public discussion of IQ would now be more firmly grounded in science?

It didn’t happen. Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray’s *The Bell Curve* was published in 1994, and real science was hard to find in the media circus that ensued. Herrnstein and Murray’s central claim about IQ differences shaping class divisions continues to be the subject of reasoned debate among social scientists. But non-experts in the media questioned whether IQ is even a valid concept. Intelligence research—psychometrics—is a pseudoscience, they said. The tests are meaningless, elitist, biased against women and minorities, important only to genetic determinists. And even to discuss group differences in IQ was called racist.

In short, the media did everything Snyderman and Rothman had warned against six years earlier. As a consequence, the interesting policy implications explored by Herrnstein and Murray were lost in the firestorm.


The American Psychological Association (APA) tried to set the record straight in 1996 with a report written by a committee of experts. Among the specific conclusions drawn by the APA were that IQ tests reliably measure a real human trait, that ethnic differences in average IQ exist, that good tests of IQ are not culturally biased against minority groups, and that IQ is a product of both genetic inheritance and early childhood environment. Another report signed by 52 experts, entitled “Mainstream Science on Intelligence,” stated similar facts and was printed in the *Wall Street Journal*.

“These may be harbingers of a shift in the media’s treatment of intelligence,” an optimistic Charles Murray wrote at the time. “There is now a real chance that the press will begin to discover that it has been missing the story.”

He was wrong. The APA report fell down the memory hole, and the media’s understanding of IQ again fell back to that state of comfortable misinformation that Snyderman and Rothman had observed years earlier.

So when Larry Summers, then the president of Harvard University, speculated in 2005 that women might be naturally less gifted in math and science, the intense backlash contributed to his ouster.

The black and white IQ distributions in the NLSY, Version I



Two years later, when famed scientist James Watson noted the low average IQ scores of sub-Saharan Africans, he was forced to resign from his lab, taking his Nobel Prize with him.

When a Harvard law student was discovered in 2010 to have suggested in a private email that the black-white IQ gap might have a genetic component, the dean publicly condemned her amid a campus-wide outcry. Only profuse apologies seem to have saved her career.

In none of these cases did an appeal to science tamp down the controversy or help to prevent future ones. My own time in the media crosshairs would be no different.

So what did I write that created such a fuss? In brief, my dissertation shows that recent immigrants score lower than U.S.-born whites on a variety of cognitive tests. Using statistical analysis, it suggests that the test-score differential is due primarily to a real cognitive deficit rather than to culture or language bias. It analyzes how that deficit could affect socioeconomic assimilation, and concludes by exploring how IQ selection might be incorporated, as one factor among many, into immigration policy.

Because a large number of recent immigrants are from Latin America, I reviewed the literature showing that Hispanic IQ scores fall between white and black scores in the United States. This fact isn't controversial among experts, but citing it seems to have fueled much of the media backlash.

And what a backlash it was. It started back in May when I coauthored an unrelated study that estimates the fiscal cost of granting amnesty to illegal immigrants. Opponents seeking to discredit that study pointed to my dissertation, and the firestorm was lit. Reporters pulled the dissertation quotes they found "shocking" and featured them in news stories about anti-immigration extremism. Well-established scientific findings were treated as self-evidently wrong—and likely the product of bigotry.

The professional commentators eagerly ran with that theme. Jennifer Rubin of the *Washington Post* called me a “fringe character.” Will Wilkinson of the *Economist* decried my “repugnant prejudice.” The *New York Daily News* published an unsigned editorial describing me as “the most twisted sort of intellectual” who is “peddling offensive tripe.” The *Guardian*’s Ana Marie Cox, whose quote began this article, called me a “bigot” and a “more subtle and dangerous kind of extremist.”

As with all the past incidents, most reporters learned nothing about IQ and seemed indifferent to any lessons for public policy. The works of mainstream scholars designed to educate lay people—*The IQ Controversy*, the APA report, “Mainstream Science on Intelligence,” etc.—were nowhere to be found.

Not all the media coverage was divorced from real science. Journalists such as Robert VerBruggen and Michael Barone wrote insightful reaction pieces. And the science-oriented blogosphere, which is increasingly the go-to place for expert commentary, provided some of the best coverage.

But it’s difficult to have a mature policy conversation when other journalists are doing little more than name-calling. It’s like convening a scientific conference on the causes of autism, only to have the participants drowned out by anti-vaccine protesters.

For too many people confronted with IQ issues, emotion trumps reason. Some are even angry that I never apologized for my work. I find that sentiment baffling. Apologize for stating empirical facts relevant to public policy? I could never be so craven. And apologize to whom—people who don’t like those facts? The demands for an apology illustrate the emotionalism that often governs our political discourse.

What causes so many in the media to react emotionally when it comes to IQ? Snyderman and Rothman believe it is a naturally uncomfortable topic in modern liberal democracies. The possibility of intractable differences among people does not fit easily into the worldview of journalists and other members of the intellectual class who have an aversion to inequality. The unfortunate—but all too human—reaction is to avoid seriously grappling with inconvenient truths. And I suspect the people who lash out in anger are the ones who are most internally conflicted.

But I see little value in speculating further about causes. Change is what’s needed. And the first thing for reporters, commentators, and non-experts to do is to stop demonizing public discussion of IQ differences. Stop calling names. Stop trying to get people fired. Most of all, stop making pronouncements about research without first reading the literature or consulting people who have.

This is not just about academic freedom or any one scholar’s reputation. Cognitive differences can inform our understanding of a number of policy issues—everything from

education, to military recruitment, to employment discrimination to, yes, immigration. Start treating the science of mental ability seriously, and both political discourse and public policy will be better for it.

Politico (August, 2013). Jason Richwine
is a public policy analyst in Washington, D.C.

The color of crime

by Jared Taylor

New Century Foundation is an organization founded in 1994 to study immigration and race relations so as to better understand the consequences of America's increasing diversity.

Perhaps the most important publication of New Century Foundation is *The Color of Crime*, New Century Foundation's report on differences in crime rates by race, bias in the justice system, and interracial crime. First published as a monograph in 1999, the 2005 edition of *The Color of Crime* is available online as a free PDF download in the website *American Renaissance*.

Major Findings

Police and the justice system are not biased against minorities.

Crime Rates

Blacks are seven times more likely than people of other races to commit murder, and eight times more likely to commit robbery.

When blacks commit crimes of violence, they are nearly three times more likely than non-blacks to use a gun, and more than twice as likely to use a knife.

Hispanics commit violent crimes at roughly three times the white rate, and Asians commit violent crimes at about one quarter the white rate.

The single best indicator of violent crime levels in an area is the percentage of the population that is black and Hispanic.

Interracial Crime

Of the nearly 770,000 violent interracial crimes committed every year involving blacks and whites, blacks commit 85 percent and whites commit 15 percent.

Blacks commit more violent crime against whites than against blacks. Forty-five percent of their victims are white, 43 percent are black, and 10 percent are Hispanic. When whites commit violent crime, only three percent of their victims are black.

Blacks are an estimated 39 times more likely to commit a violent crime against a white than vice versa, and 136 times more likely to commit robbery.

Blacks are 2.25 times more likely to commit officially-designated hate crimes against whites than vice versa.

Gangs

Only 10 percent of youth gang members are white. Hispanics are 19 times more likely than whites to be members of youth gangs. Blacks are 15 times more likely, and Asians are nine times more likely.

Incarceration

Between 1980 and 2003 the US incarceration rate more than tripled, from 139 to 482 per 100,000, and the number of prisoners increased from 320,000 to 1.39 million. Blacks are seven times more likely to be in prison than whites. Hispanics are three times more likely.

The roots of civilization

by William L. Pierce

Turn on a local television news program in just about any large city in this country, and the chances are nearly a hundred percent that you'll hear and see at least one Black announcer telling you what's happening. He'll be dressed and groomed just like the White announcers, and, in most cases, his enunciation will be so similar that you can close your eyes for a moment and almost convince yourself that you are listening to a White person.

In smoothly modulated tones the Black announcer will tell you about the intricacies of the latest financial scandal at city hall, give you a crisp rundown on upcoming cultural events, and perhaps even offer a sage comment or two on the state of public morality. Never once will he stumble over the polysyllabic words in his script or lapse into ghetto speech. At the end of the program he will engage in the customary few seconds of light banter with the other news announcers, and you can hardly help being overwhelmed by the conviction that, really, the only difference between him and his White colleagues is a matter of pigmentation.

That, of course, is exactly the conviction the directors and producers of the program intend you to be overwhelmed by. It is a conviction totally at odds with that held by most White Americans only a generation ago. Of course, the *Amos'n'Andy* image of Blacks hardly able to speak or tie their shoes was an overly simplistic image, but so is the one now created by today's media managers. Blacks can be trained to read news scripts with competence, to get to work on time and sober, and to dress and talk almost exactly like the best type of Whites. But the differences between Blacks and Whites nevertheless run far more than skin deep. Those concerned with the survival of America and of Western Civilization need to understand these differences fully.

The difference which has been most widely discussed is the quantitative difference in the average Intelligence Quotient, or IQ for short, between Blacks and Whites. For many decades in this country, despite intensive efforts by educators, politicians and the testing companies themselves, Blacks have and still do consistently score 15 points lower than Whites on standardized IQ tests.

But there is also a qualitative difference in the intelligence of Blacks and Whites, and this difference is even more significant than the quantitative difference in IQs. Blacks, in other words, are not just on average slower to learn than Whites, but their mental processes differ in their essential nature from those of Whites.

At learning tasks which require only memory—for example, simple arithmetical operations and spelling—properly motivated Blacks can do nearly as well as Whites. But at tasks which require abstraction, or inference of a general rule from a series of instances—and this includes virtually all problem-solving operations—Black performance falls far below that of Whites.

This Black inability to reason inferentially and to deal with abstract concepts is reflected in the almost total absence of Blacks, despite decades of “affirmative action,” in those professions requiring abstract reasoning ability of a high order: physics and mathematics, for example. Government quotas have brought a sharp increase in the number of Blacks in American colleges and universities in recent decades, and Blacks have flooded into many professions as a result, but the sciences have remained virtually all-White. You may see Black nuclear physicists in the movies, but in real life the only Blacks you will find in physics labs are janitors and technicians—and not many have qualified as technicians.

This qualitative difference in racial intelligence is overlooked by many—and it is easy to see why this is so: most of us have a simplistic notion of human intelligence. We think of some people as being “dull” or “slow” and others as being “bright.” If a person is “dull” he is slackjawed and unkempt, his speech is slow, and his vocabulary is limited; our vision of him is modeled on that of the classic village idiot. And we think of a “bright” person as one with a quick tongue and a neat appearance.

We have been taught by TV that our former classification of Blacks as a race of village idiots was in error. So now we make the opposite error of assuming that, since many of them have a quick tongue and a neat appearance, they are approximately as “bright” as White people.

Human intelligence is many-faceted. It cannot be adequately characterized by such terms as “dullness” or “brightness.” A good memory and a facile tongue—that is, what modern educators loosely refer to as “verbal skills”—do not imply an ability to deal with abstract concepts and solve problems.

The former and the latter are separate—and independent—facets of intelligence. The former is what we more easily notice, but it is the latter on which our civilization is based. And the latter is closely linked to race.

The racial dependence of abstract reasoning ability is no secret. Anatomists have been aware for many years of the morphological differences between the brains of Blacks and

Whites, and neurologists and psychologists today understand that it is in precisely those portions of the brain which in Blacks are less developed than in Whites that abstract reasoning takes place.

But because Blacks do not suffer a corresponding deficiency in their ability to develop verbal skills, we allow ourselves to assume equality where there is none, and we try to explain away troublesome facts like low IQ scores with nonsense about “cultural bias.” One only has to look at the high IQ scores of recent Asian immigrants, who suffer far more than US Blacks from cultural differences, to put the lie to that argument.

This error in assuming Black intellectual equality on the basis of the skills displayed by Black news announcers or entertainers is just one aspect of a general tendency today to confuse style for substance. Attainments of substance require exacting analysis and prudent judgment, and an understanding of underlying principles. That’s too much like work for many moderns. We have, it seems, now come to prefer style to substance. This could prove fatal to our civilization.

“Verbal skills” may have a high survival value for the individual who possesses them, but they are not civilization-building skills. A smooth line of patter may help in selling rugs or insurance; the fast talker may more often land the good job or the pretty girl; the person with a large vocabulary and an easy, self-confident mode of expression usually makes a good impression on others—a “bright” impression. But it is the analytical thinker, the problem-solver, who, glib or not, is the founder and sustainer of civilizations.

The clever office-seeker, the successful rug merchant, the adaptable mimic, the fluent news announcer—all have more-or-less useful roles to play in civilized life—but the very existence of that civilized life depends upon men with an altogether different set of skills. That is true of Western Civilization today, and it will also be true of the future civilization we must build if the West continues on its downward spiral.

Today Western Liberals are working very hard to help the Third World become “developed”—that is, civilized. They want to prove that the Blacks and Browns of this world have just as much capacity for civilization as Whites do. And if one visits Kenya or Nigeria, one sees what does seem like a Black civilization: Blacks driving automobiles, operating elevators, using computers and calculators and telephones, and even flying airplanes.

But it is an illusion. It is the style of civilization rather than its substance. And to the extent that even the style is maintained, there is a White minority present to keep the wheels turning. In those African countries which forced nearly all Whites to leave, civilization has ground rapidly to a halt and the jungle vines have begun taking over again.

When a diesel tractor or an electrical generator or a telephone switching system breaks down in Africa, it stays broken down until a White man fixes it—despite all the Black graduates African universities have been turning out recently. And it is not a cultural problem or an educational problem.

In this country half a century ago few farmers had ever seen a university. Many had not even been to high school. Yet, when a tractor broke down they got it running again, one way or another. They pulled it into the barn, took it apart, puzzled out the difficulty, figured a way to fix it—and then did it, often using extremely primitive facilities. It wasn't a matter of culture. It's what was called "Yankee ingenuity." It's a racial trait.

Today civilization is more complex than it was fifty years ago. A considerably higher degree of "Yankee ingenuity" is required to keep it running. Very few of us who talk glibly about space ships and lasers and computers realize that we owe the existence of these things to an extraordinarily tiny minority of our people. The technology as well as the science involved in producing something like a pocket calculator is quite complex. A lot of people can talk about it, but very, very few are capable of actually solving the problems—or even being taught to solve the problems—involved in designing and building such a device so that it does what it is supposed to do.

Another thing that many of us do not realize is what a thin thread it is which supports civilizations in general and our present technological civilization in particular. We are holding onto this thread only by the skin of our teeth, only by exerting ourselves to the utmost of our creative abilities.

I am afraid that the average American of today would assume—if he bothered to think about it—that if the average IQ of our nation were to decline by, say, five per cent as a result of racial interbreeding or a continuation of other dysgenic practices, it would perhaps cause a corresponding decline of five per cent in the level of our civilization.

Not so! A five per cent decline in average IQ would cause our civilization to collapse. That is exactly what has happened to many other civilizations in the past, far less technologically advanced than ours. Our situation is much more precarious.

The level of civilization that a people can develop and maintain is a function of the biological quality, the racial quality, of that people—in particular, of its problem-solving ability. That is why Blacks and certain other races never developed even a rudimentary civilization and are incapable of sustaining a civilization built for them by Whites—despite the apparent "brightness" of many Blacks. And it is why the race which built Western Civilization not only must regain exclusive possession of its territories, but must also act quickly to change those policies and institutions which are causing an increasing percentage of those born to our own race to be problem-makers rather than problem-solvers.

We must do this because it is the only way our race, nation and civilization can be rescued from their decline. But our civilization is not an end in itself. The tools of a civilization, once it has reached a sufficiently high level—and we have reached that level—allow us not only to weed out the problem-makers from our midst, but to insure that we will produce even more capable problem-solvers than we have produced in the past. That, in turn, will allow the achievement and maintenance of a still-higher level of civilization—which will even further enhance our capabilities for progress in every realm.

We stand today at a threshold. If we cross it successfully, we will be on the upward path toward a world of progress, peace, prosperity, knowledge, and wisdom beyond imagining. To cross this threshold requires a clear understanding of what it is that lies at the roots of civilization; it requires the ability to distinguish between style and substance; and it requires that we value substance above style.

National Vanguard (issue number 59, 1978). A physicist by profession, William Pierce (1933-2002) was the founder of *National Alliance*. In the opinion of the present editor, Pierce was the best mind that the United States has ever produced. This book reproduces several texts authored by Pierce.

The Jewish Problem

The Jewish problem is one of the greatest problems in the world, and no man, be he writer, politician or diplomatist, can be considered mature until he has striven to face it squarely on its merits.

—Henry Wickham Steed

Seeing the forest

by William Pierce

Every week I receive a number of letters from listeners who believe that I blame the Jews too much for the destruction of our society. I'm not referring now to the letters from crazed Christian fundamentalists who rave at me about the Jews being "God's chosen people" and therefore entitled to do whatever they want without criticism. (These pitiful souls tell me, "God'll get you if you say anything bad about the Jews. Don't you know that Jesus was a Jew?") And I also am not referring to the letters from lemmings, who simply parrot back the Politically Correct party line they've learned from watching television, to the effect that Jews are just like everybody else, except better, and that the only reason I speak critically of them in my broadcasts is that I'm jealous of their success. They tell me that I'm an embittered loser who lives in a trailer, has bad teeth, and never got an education, and that I spend most of my time getting drunk and doing intimate things with my female relatives, because the media have taught them that all people who live in West Virginia are like that. Anyway, I never waste time arguing with people about their religion, whether it is Christian fundamentalism or Political Correctness. Unless people have a reasoned basis for their beliefs, a reasoned argument with them is pointless.

The believers I want to argue with today are those who believe that I am incorrect in imputing bad motives to the Jews as a whole. Some of them tell me, it's not the Jews per se who're destroying our race and our civilization; it's the rich people, Jewish and non-Jewish. It's the greedy billionaires, who keep our borders open to the Third World because they want a steady supply of cheap labor. It's the crooked lawyers, Jewish and non-Jewish, who run our legislatures and our courts to enrich themselves rather than to give us good laws and justice.

And of course, the people who tell me this are correct—up to a point. It is true that Gentile billionaires do tend to put their further enrichment at the top of their list, and they do tend to go along with the Jewish billionaires in many things. They seldom see any profit to themselves in opposing the Jews, even when they don't agree ideologically with them. Billionaires are more inclined to go with existing trends and try to profit from them than to buck those trends and risk losing money. It has been truly said that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to... do anything which might diminish his fortune. And it also is true that most lawyers chose their profession not

with the aim of serving their people or because they are interested in law, but rather because they see it as a way to personal wealth and power. And it also is true that we have a lawyer-ridden society. We should have people other than lawyers setting policy.

More generally, it is true that if one looks into every destructive institution in our society, if one looks behind every destructive policy, one finds non-Jews as well as Jews. The ruinous immigration policy we have now in the United States is favored by some Gentiles as well as by virtually all Jews. The 1965 immigration law which shifted the flow of immigrants into this country from mostly European to mostly non-European was pushed primarily by Jews, but Senator Ted Kennedy was a co-sponsor of the law. The Jews may be taking over organized crime in America, but there still are some Italians involved in it.² The most active legislators in the Congress pushing for the curtailment of our right to keep and bear arms are Jews, but many Gentiles also are involved. If we look into the destructive exploitation of our natural environment, the cutting down of our forests and the strip-mining of our land and the polluting of our rivers, we probably will find greedy and short-sighted Gentile profiteers more often than we will find Jews. And even in the mass media, one can still find some non-Jewish media bosses who promote essentially the same party line as the Jewish media bosses: Rupert Murdoch is an example.

All of that is true. So, then, why don't I just complain about the plutocrats or the lawyers or the businessmen? Why do I single out the Jews? The answer to that is that if we don't look at the Jews specifically, if we don't try to understand them as Jews, then we can never really understand what is happening to our race and our civilization. And if we don't understand what's happening, we're much less likely to be able to change things for the better. We need to understand the process, and in order to understand the process we need to understand the Jewish role in it—because it is the key role.

Let's back off a bit and just ask ourselves, what is the single most powerful and influential institution in American life today? What institution, more than any other, is promoting the worst and most destructive trends in American life? Is it professional basketball? That's certainly a noxious influence—but it's not the most noxious. Is it the Internal Revenue Service? No. It isn't even the Clinton government of which the Internal Revenue Service is a part, because the Clinton government itself is only a creature of the most powerful institution, and that most powerful institution is made up of the mass media of news and entertainment which together shape public opinion and control public policy. And these media in turn are dominated by Jews.

I won't go into all of the names and organizational relationships today, because I've done that a number of times in past broadcasts, and the details are all in a pamphlet I publish and update regularly, it's called *Who Rules America?*, and if you send \$2 to the sponsors of this broadcast they'll send you a copy. But just a quick summary: the three giants in the

² See e.g., Hervé Ryssen's *La mafia juive* (Levallois-Perret: Éditions Baskerville, 2008). (Note of the Ed.)

electronic media are Disney-ABC, headed by Michael Eisner; Time Warner-CNN, headed by Gerald Levin; and the new Viacom-CBS conglomerate, headed by Sumner Redstone. Eisner, Levin, and Redstone are all Jews, but it's not just the men at the top who're Jews; these media giants are staffed by Jews from top to bottom.³

In the print media the country's three most influential newspapers are the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and the *Washington Post*. All three of them are owned or controlled by Jews. The only three widely read weekly news magazines in the United States are *Time*, which is owned by Gerald Levin's Time Warner-CNN; *Newsweek*, which is owned by Katharine Meyer Graham's *Washington Post* Company; and *U.S. News & World Report*, which is owned by Jewish real-estate developer Mort Zuckerman. The story is the same in the Hollywood film industry and throughout the rest of the mass media of news and entertainment.

Now, there are people who will tell you with a straight face that this almost total domination of the most powerful institution in our society by the Jewish minority, which makes up only 2.5 per cent of the U.S. population, is just a coincidence, that it has no sinister significance. It just as well could have been Mormons or Jehovah's Witnesses who happened to rule the media. What difference does it make?

When grown men say something like that, you can safely bet that there's something other than reason at work. Usually it's fear: not so much a conscious fear as a conditioned avoidance reflex, the product of a long-term program of media conditioning of the public never to say or even think anything negative about Jews, lest one be labelled an "anti-Semite" or a "Nazi." Really, the proper name for this sort of conditioning is "brainwashing."

Think about it for a minute.

Imagine yourself in a group of yuppies, at a restaurant, say, or a cocktail party: a fairly sophisticated and irreverent sort of crowd. You can make a joke about the Pope, and even the Catholics in the crowd will laugh. You can say something smutty about Mother Teresa or Martin Luther King without objection. You can express your dislike for homosexuals or feminists. Some of those present may argue against you, but they are not likely to get uptight about it. But if you want to stop the conversation cold and give everyone present a bad case of heartburn, just say something unfriendly about the Jews: either about a specific Jew or the Jews as a whole. Say, for example, something like, "Well, now that that Jew Sumner Redstone has grabbed CBS, there's hardly any part of the mass media that the Jews don't own. I think that's not good for America." Say that, and then smell the fear in the air as your friends choke on their martinis.

³ See also "Jews and the media: shaping 'ways of seeing'" in *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* by Kevin MacDonald. (Note of the Ed.)

Perhaps I exaggerate a bit, but not much. The Jews do get special treatment, and that is no more a coincidence than their control of the mass media. It has been planned. It is has been engineered.

Now, I am sure that, having said that, the minds of many of my listeners have just locked gears as the conditioned reflex forbidding them to think any unfriendly thought about Jews kicks in. But you know, it is possible to overcome this conditioning, this brainwashing—unless you're a lemming, that is. Lemmings can't overcome it because they don't want to overcome it. They don't want to think any disapproved thought, any thought that everyone else isn't thinking. But if you're a person who wants to think clearly about this matter, all you have to do is begin looking at the facts. Take your time. Study the facts carefully: not just the facts I offer to you, but also everything else you can dig up on the subject. Think about the implications. Reach your own conclusions. You can overcome the conditioned fear—and as a responsible adult, as a responsible American, as a responsible member of your race, you should.

And when you no longer are afraid and you finally are able to look the truth squarely in the face, you no longer will believe that it is a coincidence that the Jews have elbowed their way into virtually every position of control in the mass media. You no longer will believe that the Jews do not use the power consciously and collectively that this media control gives them. I'll say that again: the Jews use their control over the mass media, not as individual capitalists, the way the few non-Jews in the media do, but they use it collectively and cooperatively to advance Jewish interests. That is why you can see a common propaganda agenda throughout all of the controlled media. They all promote the image of the Jew as a victim, never as a predator or aggressor; they all promote the image of the Jews as sensitive and creative and sympathetic, not as the sort to plan and organize a bloody Bolshevik revolution and butcher tens of millions of innocent Russians and Ukrainians⁴ or to run the White-slave business and force thousands of young European girls into a life of prostitution every year—or as the sort to elbow their way into the key positions of media control and then to help their fellow Jews do the same thing.

And they also all push interracial sex. They all push the lie that most interracial crime is White on Black. They all suppress any news which contradicts that lie. They all try to persuade us that homosexuality is normal and acceptable, just an alternative life-style. They all propagandize for multiculturalism and for more diversity and for keeping our borders open to the Third World and for scrapping the Second Amendment—all of them.

Now, let's back up for a moment, because I've just said something extremely important, and I want to be sure that it sinks in: that I have convinced you. I think that most perceptive and responsible people, once they have made up their minds that they want to

⁴ See e.g., the excerpts from *Esau's Tears* by Albert Lindemann later in this book. (Note of the Ed.)

know the truth, can accept the fact of Jewish media control; that fact is really undeniable. I think that most of them can then take the next step and conclude that this Jewish media control is not just a coincidence: they can conclude that the Jews deliberately and cooperatively set out to achieve this control and then to use it to advance their collective interests.

People can understand that in terms of the sort of group behavior with which they already are familiar. The members of other groups also cooperate in order to achieve group power and then use this power to advance their group interests. And so it should not be surprising that the Jews in the media collaborate to create a favorable image of themselves in the public mind. Most people can persuade themselves that it's not "anti-Semitic" to believe that Jews behave like many other groups do in order to advance their group interests.

It's the next step that is difficult for many people: it is recognizing that the propaganda agenda of the Jewish media bosses goes far beyond promoting a favorable image of themselves; it also promotes everything which is unfavorable to the non-Jewish majority. And this destructive propaganda is not a coincidence either; it is the product of a planned, deliberate, collaborative effort.

Reaching this conclusion is a big step, a difficult step, for many people—even for people who want to understand, who want to know the truth. It's a big step because it separates the Jews from every other special-interest group. It sets the Jews aside from the rest of humanity and identifies them as a uniquely hostile, destructive, and deceptive group. It identifies them as a group which is uniquely dangerous to our people. And it leaves anyone who takes this step open to the charge of "anti-Semitism." Certainly, if you take this step—if you reach this conclusion—and you announce your conclusion publicly, you will be denounced as an "anti-Semite" by the media bosses—and probably by the lemmings too.

And so I don't want you just to take my word for this very important conclusion about the nature of the Jews as a uniquely hostile and dangerous group. I want you to study the facts. I want you to think about the evidence and reach your own conclusion. But I don't want you to stop short of a conclusion because of fear, because of brainwashing. I want you to overcome your fear and examine the evidence objectively.

I will make a few more observations about this conclusion and its implications now, however. Let me tell you, it really is the key to understanding many other things: the history of the Jews in Europe—and elsewhere. Why were the Jews always picked on and persecuted far more than any other group? Why did everyone else always hate them? Why have they been kicked out of virtually every country in Europe during the past thousand years: out of England and Spain and Portugal and France and Sweden and Germany and a dozen other countries and told never to come back, only to sneak back in and then be

kicked out again? The Jews will tell you that it was Christian bigotry. But Christian bigotry cannot explain why the Egyptians threw them out of Egypt more than a thousand years before Christ, and it cannot explain why the pagan Greeks and Romans hated them. I used to wonder about these things. And even after I began to suspect that the socially and racially destructive activities of the Jews were planned and deliberate, I didn't know why. It didn't make sense to me that the Jews would deliberately seek to destroy a society in which they were riding high—that they would deliberately drill holes in the bottom of a boat in which they were passengers. I couldn't figure it out—until I understood the nature of the Jews.

And that nature really is unique. At some time far back in the prehistoric period, certainly more than 3,000 years ago, the Jews developed a unique mode of survival as predators and parasites. Whereas other races, other tribes, sought either to live alone among their own kind—or to conquer other tribes militarily and take their land or require them to pay tribute—the Jews sought to invade the territory of other races by stealth and then to subvert them, to undermine their morale, to break down the order and structure in their societies as a concomitant to controlling them and exploiting them.

In the beginning, thousands of years ago, this may have been only a novel plan for gaining control of a particular neighbor, but eventually it developed into a way of life. It became part of their religion, and eventually it got into their genes. I believe that today they really can't help themselves. And as I said before, you do need to think carefully about this. You need to study the facts. It's difficult for many people to understand the Jews because they really are different from every other ethnic group.

One aspect of the Jewish problem which adds to the difficulty many people have in coming to grips with it is that the Jews are not just a scheming and sinister *kehillah* of adult male media bosses. They are a complete community, with women and children and many members on the fringes: part-Jews, dissidents, and so on—even a few anti-Jewish Jews. There are approximately six million Jews in the United States, by their own count, and they can't all be film studio owners or newspaper publishers or promoters of “rap” music or Hollywood scriptwriters. Most of them live and work in a way which gives them relatively little personal opportunity for damaging our society. They are simply teachers and businessmen and merchants and lawyers and doctors, earning a living more or less like everyone else—but not quite.

You must back off a bit in order to see the forest rather than just the trees. The essential thing about the forest is that it is destroying our world. It is a parasitic forest. It is injecting spiritual and cultural poison into our civilization and into the life of our people and sucking up nutrients to enrich itself and grow even more destructive. Perhaps only 10 per cent of the trees in this Jewish forest have roots deep enough to inject their poison into us, and the other 90 per cent play only supporting roles of one sort or another. It is still the whole forest which is our problem. If the forest were not here we would not have had

to endure the curse of Bolshevism. If the forest were not here America would not be growing darker and more degenerate by the year. It is the whole forest, not just a few of the most poisonous trees in it, which must be uprooted and removed from our soil if we are to become healthy again.

The essential point again is this: not every Jew has a leading role in promoting the evils which are destroying us, and not every person is a Jew who is collaborating with the leading Jews who are promoting evil, but it is only because the Jews as a whole are among us that the evils they always promote are overwhelming us. If the Jews were not present we could overcome the evil men of our own race. The evil men of our own race may seek their own profit at the expense of the rest of us, but they do not seek to destroy our race. Only the Jews seek that.

Free Speech
October 1999
Volume V, Number 10

The saga of the European Jewry

by Arthur Kemp

Anti-Semitism—or, more accurately, anti-Jewishness—was not an invention of Hitler nor of his National Socialist German Workers' Party. Anti-Jewish sentiment has always stalked the Jews, where-ever they went: it seems as if their very presence always elicited a negative and hostile response from virtually all the nations in which they settled. Anti-Jewish sentiment existed long before Christianity, and the introduction of that religion and its distortions merely provided another means of expression for the latent anti-Jewish feeling which always followed the Jews like a shadow.

Origins of anti-Jewish sentiment. The origins of this original anti-Jewish feeling lie within the nature of Jewish society itself: exclusively ethno-centric with a binding religion and inward looking culture, the Jews always managed to maintain themselves as an isolated community in all of the nations in which they settled. This tradition has maintained itself to this day.

For this reason, Jews tended to live together in tightly knit communities in cities: these Jewish blocks came to be called ghettos, and it is important to realize that the first ghettos were entirely voluntary Jewish neighbourhoods. This was then re-enforced by religious laws limiting membership of the Jewish community by race—only people born of Jewish women could be accepted as Jews. This is another practice which has survived to the present day—people of no direct Jewish ancestry can only become Jews with great difficulty, and even then a large section of the Jewish community, the orthodox Jews, will not recognize converts as true Jews.

Finally, the well-known Jewish propensity for business and the ability to accumulate vast amounts of money—a phenomena well known to this day—was the source of much original anti-Jewish feeling. Gentiles (or, *Goy* as the Jewish Talmud) refer to non-Jews of all races, with the literal translation of *cattle*—which in itself is an important insight of how the writers of the Talmud viewed the outside world.

The true origins of anti-Jewish feeling therefore lies in a combination of three major factors:

- the self-imposed isolation of the Jewish people;
- the open hostility to Non-Jews as espoused in their ethno-centric and tightly binding religion; and
- the propensity of their financial dealings.

Thus it was that the first anti-Jewish outbursts occurred long before the introduction of Christianity. Christianity merely added to these emotions: as the wave of Christian fanaticism swept Europe, all sense of reason or rationality was lost, and, forgetting that Christianity itself had sprung from Judaism, the Christians gave vent to their long simmering dislike of the Jews by accusing them of being the killers of Christ to boot.

The hostility was however, reciprocated: the Talmud, which is a collection of rabbinical writings added to the Old Testament, contains many violently anti-Gentile remarks, comparing non-Jewish women to whores and providing specific instruction on how it is permissible for Jews to cheat non-Jews in business.

Both Christians and Jews then, altered their religious teachings in attempts to whip up hostility to each other in a bizarre semi-religious and semi-racial clash.

Jews occupy high posts in Moorish Spain and Portugal. After the decline of the Roman Empire, Jews started settling in larger numbers in Western Europe, with many Sephardic Jews crossing over from Africa into Spain. Hot on their heels came the Muslim Moors, who gave the Jews favoured status in Moorish occupied Spain: Jews came to fill the highest position in the Moorish republic of Granada in Spain and owned one-third of all the real estate in Barcelona.

When the Moorish occupation of Spain was finally ended, the Christian victors did not take kindly to what they correctly saw as Jewish collaboration with the Moors. This led to the Spanish version of the Inquisition, which was primarily aimed at Jews who had falsely converted to Christianity in an attempt to escape the revenge attacks on Jews carried out by the victorious Christian armies. Finally, the Jews were formally expelled from Spain in 1492, the same year that Christopher Columbus set foot in the Americas.

France. As avid supporters of the French Revolution, Jews were rewarded when the National Assembly enfranchised Jews in 1791, simultaneously stripping all restrictions which had been placed on them.

Napoleon Bonaparte was given much support by Europe's Jews in his campaigns across Europe, for wherever he went he lifted whatever restrictions there had been upon the Jews. Once again, this was only good for Jews over the short term. The downside came when Napoleon was finally beaten: Jews were associated with the destruction that his military adventures had wrought; virtually all of the reforms he had instituted were reversed as a result. However, by the 1860s, most of the Jewish communities in Western Europe had more or less been de-ghettoized, and Napoleon's reforms had for the greatest part been re-instituted.

The First Great Brothers' War. The World Zionist movement, a nationalist Jewish organization founded by European Jews to create a national homeland for Jews in Palestine, saw an opportunity open up with the British occupation of Palestine, and persuaded the British foreign minister, Lord Arthur Balfour, to issue a public promise in 1917 to the effect that Britain would support the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. This public promise became known as the Balfour Declaration.

In return for this undertaking, the World Zionist Movement then promised Britain that it would marshal the world's Jews behind the Allied cause and, more importantly, endeavours to use their influence to bring the United States of America into the war. In this way, considerable pressure was brought to bear on the American government to enter the war against Germany, although by this stage they hardly needed much prompting. While the World Zionist Congress was actively working behind the scenes with the powerful Jewish lobby in the American government, the course of the war at sea presented the American president, Woodrow Wilson, with an opportunity to enter the war against Germany, despite his presidential election campaign having been specifically fought on a non-interventionist ticket. In February 1917, the US broke off diplomatic relations with Germany and formally declared war in April. The timing of the US entry into the war—virtually simultaneously with the Balfour Declaration—is too good to be coincidental. By June 1917, more than 175,000 American troops were already in France; by the end of the war more than two million Americans had been deployed in France.

Waves of fresh American troops captured 14,000 exhausted and virtually starving German troops at Saint-Mihiel, and then pushed on through the Argonne forest, breaking the German lines between Metz and Sedan.

With this major defeat, the German government asked for an armistice in October 1918—this attempt to end the war failed when the American president Woodrow Wilson insisted on negotiating only with a democratic German government. The British then pushed home an attack in Belgium and Northern France and early in November American and French forces reached Sedan. By early November, the Hindenburg line had been broken and the Germans were in disarray.

The suppressed link: Jews and communism. The creation of the Soviet Union was to impact upon history for the greater part of the 20th Century—and an understanding of the sub-racial and ideological divisions it caused is crucial to understanding not only the events of that century, but also to understanding the flare up of anti-Jewish sentiment which culminated in the creation of the Third Reich in Germany. For the Soviet Union's best kept secret was that the Bolshevik elite had one outstanding characteristic: it had an inordinately large number of Jews in its controlling body.

Virtually all of the important Bolshevik leaders were Jews: they included the “father of the revolution,” Leon Trotsky (whose real name was Lev Bronstein: in an attempt to hide his Jewishness, he adopted the name Trotsky); Lev Kamenev, the early Bolshevik leader who later went on to become a leading member of the Politburo, was born with the surname Rosenfeld; Grigori Zinoviev, head of the Petrograd Soviet, was born with the surname Apfelbaum; and many other famous Communists of the time, such as Karl Radek, Lazar Kaganovich; and Moses Urtisky, (the head of the Cheka) who all changed their names for reasons similar to that of Trotsky. The Bolshevik's Party's Central Committee chairman, Yakov Sverdlov, was also Jewish—and it was he who gave the order to the Jewish Soviet secret policeman, Yurovsky, to murder the Tsar—Yurovsky personally carried out this order.

As if the Russian Revolution was not enough, the originator of the Communist ideology itself, Karl Marx, was also a Jew, with his family name in reality being Levi. The large Jewish role in the Russian revolution, combined with the fact that Marx had been born a Jew, was manna from heaven for the European anti-Semitic movement, and the link between Jews and Communism was exploited to the hilt, particularly by Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist (Nazi) movement in Germany during the 1920s.

It was not only in Germany that the association of Jews with Communism was made: all over the world Jews became associated with radical political movements, sometimes justifiably so, other times not. Nonetheless, the presence of so many Jews in the creation of the Soviet Union played a massive role in justifying anti-Jewish sentiment in Europe prior to, and with, the rise of Adolf Hitler. Directly after the First World War, there were another three specifically Jewish Communist revolutions in Europe itself:

- the German Jew, Kurt Eisner, led a short lived communist revolution in Munich, Bavaria from November 1918 to February 1919. At the same time that Adolf Hitler was an unknown soldier in that city, the effect of being a first hand witness to a Jewish and Communist-led revolution helped to cement Hitler's anti-Communist and anti-Jewish feelings;

- the short lived Spartacus uprising in Berlin (September 1918 to January 1919) led by the German Jews, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg; and
- the short lived Communist tyranny in Hungary led by the Jew, Bela Kun (Cohen), from March to August 1919.

These incidents all helped to identify Jews with Communism in the public mind: in this light it becomes perfectly explicable why the Nazi Party was able to win support on an anti-Communist and open anti-Jewish platform.

Jews in the later Soviet Union. Jews retained their leading roles in Soviet society until growing anti-Semitism within the Communist Party itself led to a change in policy. Trotsky was the first major Jewish casualty: he split with Stalin over the issue of international socialism and the need to spread the revolution: he was forced into exile in 1929. He was then assassinated in Mexico City in 1940, allegedly by a Stalinist agent.

By the middle 1930s, Stalin had started purging the Soviet Communist Party of other important Jews. The period immediately following the end of the Second World War and the creation of the state of Israel saw another rise in Soviet anti-Semitism: by 1953, Stalin had started purging all Jews in the Soviet hierarchy who were also Zionists. The Communists, quite correctly, saw Zionism as Jewish nationalism and contrary to the interests of an international socialist brotherhood. Many leading Russian Jews were also fervent Zionists: and it was this group that was then targeted for persecution, and who became famous throughout the rest of the lifetime of the Soviet Union as the victims of Soviet anti-Semitism. Zionism, as an expression of Jewish separatism was declared a crime against the Soviet state, and Zionist organizations were forced to close down their operations inside the Soviet Union. East Germany, as an official Soviet satellite, was forbidden by Moscow to make any reparations payments to the Zionist created state of Israel for the treatment of Jews by the Nazi government.

Not all Russian Jews were Zionists: those who were not, were generally left alone and some did achieve prominent positions within the post Stalin Soviet Union. Many thousands of Jews did however leave the Soviet Union—estimates putting the total number at over the one million mark, with most settling in Israel or the United States.

The *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, published in Jerusalem, Israel, by Jews, is available at most large public libraries and is in English. This reference book for all things Jewish is quite open about the Jewish role in Communism, particularly early Communism, and contains a large number of admissions in this regard. Under the entry for “Communism” in Volume 5, page 792, the following appears: “The Communist Movement and ideology played an important part in Jewish life, particularly in the 1920s, 1930s and during and after World War II.” On page 793, the same *Encyclopaedia Judaica* then goes on to say that “Communist

trends became widespread in virtually all Jewish communities. In some countries, Jews became the leading element in the legal and illegal Communist Parties.”

The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* goes on to reveal that the Communist International actually instructed Jews to change their names so as “not confirm right-wing propaganda that presented Communism as an alien, Jewish conspiracy.” The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* then goes on to describe the overwhelming role Jews played in creating the Soviet Union. On page 792 it says: “Individual Jews played an important role in the early stages of Bolshevism and the Soviet Regime.” On page 794, this Jewish reference book then goes to list the Jews prominent in the upper command of the Russian Communist party. These included Maxim Litvinov (later foreign minister of Soviet Russia); Grigori Zinoviev, Lwev Kamenev, Jacob Sverdlov, Lazar Kaganovich, and Karl Radek, amongst many others. The organizer of the Revolution was Trotsky, who prepared a special committee to plan and prepare the coup which brought the Communists to power. According to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, this committee, called the Military Revolutionary Committee, had five members—three of whom were Jews. The Politburo—the supreme governing body of Russia immediately after the Communist Revolution—had four Jews amongst its seven members, according to page 797 of the Jewish *Encyclopaedia Judaica*.

While many have alleged that Lenin was also Jewish, or at least of part Jewish origin, there is little concrete evidence of this. However, Lenin was ardently pro-Jewish, branding anti-Semitism (correctly) as “counter revolutionary” (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, page 798). A statement against anti-Semitism was made by Lenin in March 1919 and was “one of the rare occasions when his voice was put on a phonograph record to be used in a mass campaign against the counterrevolutionary incitement against the Jews,” according to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, page 798. One of the first laws passed by the new Soviet Communist government was to outlaw anti-Semitism (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, page 798).

Winston Churchill on the Jewish role in communism. The preponderance of Jews in the inner sanctum of the Communist revolution in Russia was in fact well known at the time that the revolution took place: it is only in the post Second World War II era that this fact has been suppressed.

A good example of the contemporary awareness of the Jewish nature of early Russian Communism can be found in the writing of the young Winston Churchill, later to become prime minister of Great Britain, who, in 1920, was also working as journalist.

In 1920, Churchill wrote a full page article for the *Illustrated Sunday Herald* on 8 February 1920 detailing the Jewish involvement in the revolution. Churchill discusses in this article the split between Jews: some are Communists, he wrote, while others are Jewish nationalists. Churchill favored the Jewish nationalists (and of course they indeed fall foul of the Jewish Communists, eventually becoming bitter enemies), and he appealed to what

he called “loyal Jews” to ensure that the Communist Jews did not succeed. Churchill went even further and blamed the Jews for “every subversive movement during the Nineteenth Century,” writing:

This movement amongst the Jews (the Russian Revolution) is not new. From the days of Spartacus Weishaupt to those of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kuhn (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany) and Emma Goldman (United States), this world wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and the reconstruction of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played, as a modern writer, Mrs. Nesta Webster, has so ably shown, a definitely recognizable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution.

It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the Nineteenth Century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities has gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire. There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the actual bringing about of the Russian Revolution by these international and for the most part atheistic Jews. Moreover, the principal inspiration and driving power comes from Jewish leaders.

Churchill also pointedly accused Leon Trotsky (Bronstein) of wanting to establish a “world wide Communistic state under Jewish domination” in this article.

Churchill was not the only journalist to note the Jewish role in the Russian Revolution: Robert Wilton, the chief correspondent for the *London Times*, who was stationed in Russia at the time, wrote in his book *The Last Days of the Romanovs* (Hornton Butterworth, London, 1920, pages 147, 22-28, 81, 118, 199, 127, 139-148) that “90 per cent” of the new Soviet government was composed of Jews. The correspondent for the *London Morning Post*, Victor Marsden, went further and actually compiled a list of names of the top 545 Bolshevik officials: of these, Marsden said, 454 were Jews and only 23 Non-Jewish Russians (*All These Things*, A.N. Field, Appendix B pages 274-276).

The US Army's telegrams. The American Army Intelligence Service had its agents in Russia at the time of the Communist Revolution, and the Jewish nature of that revolution is accurately reflected in those reports.

An American Senate subcommittee investigation into the Russian Revolution heard evidence, put on congressional record, that “In December 1919, under the presidency of a man named Apfelbaum (Zinovieff), out of the 388 members of the Bolshevik central government, only 16 happened to be real Russians, and all the rest (with the exception of a Negro from the U.S.) were Jews” (U.S. Senate Document 62, 1919). Both describe the

domination of the Bolshevik Communists by Jews, using the words “Fifty per cent of Soviet Government in each town consists of Jews of the worst type.”

Copies of documents from the US National Archives are freely available to anyone from the Washington DC, USA, office.

However, none of these authorities quoted above dared to use quite the language of a US Military Intelligence officer, one captain Montgomery Schuyler, who sent two reports to Washington in March and June 1919, describing in graphic detail the Jewish role in the Russian Revolution. Both these reports were only declassified in September 1957 and the originals are still held in the US National Archives in Washington, open for public inspection.

The first report, sent from Omsk on 1 March 1919, contains the following paragraph: “It is probably unwise to say this loudly in the United States but the Bolshevik movement is and has been since its beginning, guided and controlled by Russian Jews of the greasiest type.” The second report, dated 9 June 1919, and sent from Vladivostok, said that of the “384 commissars there were 2 Negroes, 13 Russians, 15 Chinamen, 22 Armenians and more than 300 Jews. Of the latter number 264 had come to Russia from the United States since the downfall of the Imperial Government.”

Both these American army military intelligence reports are freely available from the US National Archives in Washington DC. The importance of this information does not need to be overemphasized in the light of the crucial governing role the commissars played in the running the early Soviet society. It therefore came as no surprise when anti-Semitism was duly entered into the Soviet law books as a death penalty crime.

Excerpted from a defunct online edition of *March of the Titans: The Complete History of the White Race* (printed edition: Ostrara Publications, Iowa, USA, 2011)

From the editor's desk

Kevin MacDonald's trilogy

The second book of Kevin MacDonald's study on Jewry, *Separation and its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* (1994/2002), the first of his trilogy to be translated to German, is my favorite of MacDonald's three academic works that I read in more than two years. Professor MacDonald is the foremost scholar on the Jewish question. In *Separation and its Discontents* (hereafter *SAID*) he wrote:

Western societies, unlike prototypical Jewish cultures, do not have a primitive concern with racial purity. Rather, concern about racial purity emerges only in the late stages of Jewish-gentile group conflict...

Despite a great deal of commonality among Western anti-Semitic movements, there was a great difference between the universalistic, assimilatory tendencies of traditional Western Christianity and the exclusivistic, racist program of National Socialism. Indeed, we have seen that beginning in the 19th century an important aspect of German anti-Semitic ideology was a criticism of Western universalism and the development of peculiarly German conceptions of Christianity. A critical component of official National Socialist ideology, as represented in the thought of Alfred Rosenberg, was the idea that "the twin forces of disintegration, namely universalism and individualism, act in perpetual conflict with the Germanic concept of race." In this regard, National Socialism was indeed profoundly anti-Western. In rejecting both universalism and individualism, National Socialism resembled, much more closely than did medieval Western collectivist Christianity, its mirror image rival, Judaism. [page 196]

In a previous chapter MacDonald had written:

We shall see that with the rise of the National Socialist movement in Germany, the universalist themes of Western Christianity were completely overthrown in favor of a full-blown racist ideology of the ingroup. In Chapter Five I will argue that National Socialism is a true mirror-image of Judaism. Not surprisingly, it was also the most dangerous enemy that Judaism has confronted in its entire existence. [page 133]

One of the hypothesis advanced in *SAID* provides food for thought. MacDonald wrote, “I propose that the Christian church in late antiquity was in its very essence the embodiment of a powerful anti-Semitic movement...” (page 112). This is something I had never heard of, and reminds me my first readings of psychohistory and Lloyd deMause’s insights on why the Christ archetype galvanized the population of the ancient world, although MacDonald’s hypothesis is totally distinct and is presented from an altogether distant point of view. But after digesting what both deMause and MacDonald say, for the first time I feel I am starting to comprehend facets of Christianity that would have never occurred to me from a conventional reading to history. If MacDonald is right, the Roman Catholic Church was the earliest attempt toward a type of society that we may call collectivism for European-derived peoples.

Although Christianity always held universalist ideals at its core, it nonetheless fulfilled its role of impeding, as did the Muslim nations, that Judaism became a destructive force for the indigenous culture of the Late Roman Empire and the Early Middle Ages. One of the facts that I learnt in *SAID* is that most restrictions enacted against Jewry, initiated in the period from Eusebius to Justinian, were still active throughout Christendom until the French Revolution hit the continent with its egalitarian fury. It was precisely the so-called Enlightenment (that presently some Western dissidents are starting to call “the Dark Enlightenment”) what inspired the founding fathers of the United States of America. And contrary to those white nationalists who still insult the memory of Adolf Hitler and the movement he created, I would claim that the mortal sin of the French Revolution, the emancipation of Jewry, was not properly atoned in Europe until the arrival of a specifically racial ideology: National Socialism.

But not only Nazi Germany has been demonized in the public mind. The Inquisition is widely regarded as a black page in the history of the Church even by the most Catholic individuals that I know. In contrast to such view MacDonald presents us with a radical reevaluation of what was precisely the role of the Inquisition. On page 147 he states: “I here develop the view that the Spanish Inquisition was fundamentally an authoritarian, collectivist, and exclusionary movement that resulted from resource and reproductive competition with Jews, and particularly crypto-Jews posing as Christians.” One could even argue that, thanks to the Inquisition, for three-hundred years before the movement of independence that gave birth to Mexico, New Spain (1521-1821) was *Judenfrei*.

While reading *SAID* I could not escape the thought that whites are un-insightful because, unlike the Jews and with the exception of William Pierce and Arthur Kemp (see the long chapters in this book quoting them), very few have knowledge of the history of *their race*. If we take into account that, in one of their holydays, New York Hassidic Jews celebrate their victory over the ancient Greeks who tried to assimilate them millennia ago, a basic question comes to mind: Why don’t we celebrate the victory of Antiochus IV over the Jews, or Titus’ conquest of Jerusalem?

We do not celebrate these victories precisely for the reason that both Kemp and Pierce explain so well: neither the Greeks nor the Romans exist today. What we call contemporary Greeks or Romans are the product of centuries of blood mixing that devalued not only the genotype of the original Indo-European population, but their extended phenotype as well: the Greco-Roman hard *ethos* and their galvanizing *mythos* mostly reflected in the Homeric tales. The Greeks and Romans who embraced Christianity were a totally different breed of the pure Aryans of Sparta or the austere Latins of the Roman Republic (see e.g., the essays that I translated from *Evropa Soberana* in later chapters of this book).

MacDonald himself acknowledges on page 190 that “the Jews have continued as a creative race into the present, while the Greeks gradually merged with the barbarians and lost their distinctiveness—a point remarkably similar to Chamberlain’s ‘chaos of peoples’ in which the decline of the ancient world is attributed to loss of racial purity.” Conversely, I would say that since the Jews have conserved their genotype almost intact throughout the millennia they are able to celebrate their Maccabean revolt as if it was yesterday. In other words, had whites preserved their genes intact, some of us might still be celebrating Antiochus’ victories over the subversive tribe; or, if we knew our history with the same passion that Jews know theirs, we might still be celebrating the fall of the Temple of Jerusalem in 70 AD, or the more recent expulsion of the tribe from the Iberian peninsula.

What conventional historians ignore is that, once the Church lost its power to sell a worldview after the late 18th and early 19th centuries, our genetic individualism placed us at the mercy of a collectivist tribe.

Fortunately, the ethno-traitorous West has committed financial blunders in the 20th and 21st centuries. The dollar and all fiat currencies of the West will crash probably in this decade (I am reviewing this essay in 2014), which means that there is hope that some of us will start to understand the Jewish problem in a post-crashed world. On page 10 of *SAID* MacDonald says that “in congruence with the results of social identity research, anti-Semitism is expected to be most prominent among those most in competition with the Jews and during times of economic crisis.”

Although most readers of MacDonald treasure *The Culture of Critique*, the third and last of his trilogy on Jewry as their favorite book of this collection, I believe that MacDonald’s work should be read from the beginning. *A People that Shall Dwell Alone*, *Separation and its Discontents* and *The Culture of Critique* can help us, using William Pierce’s metaphor, to “see the forest” with crystal-clear vision.

Remember Pierce’s words? If we don’t try to understand the Jews we can never really understand what is happening to our race and our civilization. Professor MacDonald’s voluminous texts have done the hard work for us—both the trilogy and his webzine *The Occidental Observer*—in a scholarly and yet entertaining way.


On the need to undemonize Hitler

In almost any war one side can be dishonestly demonized even by a truthful enumeration of its crimes, if the crimes of its adversaries are suppressed.

—Irmin Vinson

The Holocaust perpetrated by Jew-led Bolsheviks

by Wandrin



*Note that seven million
is higher than the claimed victims
of Hitler's holocaust, and only in one year.*

Hitler didn't win an electoral majority. He won most seats and was given the Chancellorship by the German elite in 1933: the year after the Jew-led Bolsheviks deliberately starved at least six million Ukrainians to death. Can there be any real doubt that the threat of the Bolshevik terror influenced both the German voters and the decision to give Hitler the Chancellorship? Why isn't this taught in the schools?

Tens of millions killed in the first industrial scale mass murder in history from 1917 onwards—the Red Terror and War Communism under Lenin and Trotsky's leadership long before Stalin—culminating in the deliberate starvation of six million Ukrainians in 1932 as revenge for past anti-Jewish pogroms. Why isn't this taught in the schools?

Trillions of dollars and millions of man-hours have gone into creating a global memorial to the Holocaust—films, books, indoctrination of millions of school children, countless

museums—and absolutely nothing to commemorate the tens of millions murdered by the Jewish Bolsheviks. Not only a Holocaust in its own right but the primary cause of the subsequent Fascist reaction they say came out of inherent evil of the Aryan nature: a position that would be impossible to sustain if Jewish involvement in the Bolshevik holocaust was more widely known.

So, compare and contrast the collective memorial to the Jewish dead with the collective non-memorial to the non-Jewish dead and you have Talmudic morality caught in the headlights. Every single penny they spent on building Holocaustianity then works for us. Every film, every book, every museum highlights their denial of the Bolshevik Holocaust and the value they place on non-Jewish dead: Zero. Use this to destroy their moral authority first and then their power to enforce taboos. Go after the matador, not the cape.

April 20, 2011 comment at *Counter-Currents Publishing*.

Editor's note:

Those readers who still doubt that Jews were overrepresented in the Red Terror should take note that in 1997 an academic, the Jew Albert Lindemann, published a book with the imprimatur of Cambridge University corroborating the claim, as shown in the following excerpts.

Red Terror—a Jewish terror?

by Albert Lindemann[★]

Jews and Revolution. The horrors of the revolution from 1917 to 1921 were in some areas even more devastating than those of the war; the connections of Jews and socialist revolutionaries were more visible than ever before and the anti-Semitic potential greater. The perception that revolutionaries were predominantly Jewish and that Jews were particularly vicious as revolutionaries spread now from minds like those of Nicholas II—limited, paranoiac, almost pitiful—to those of a different cut, such as Woodrow Wilson and Winston Churchill. It was no longer only scandal sheets like *La Libre Parole* or the *Bessarebetz* that identified radical revolution with Jews; now that identification was made by newspapers like the *London Times*, the *Chicago Tribune*, or the *Christian Science Monitor*, all of which enjoyed a reputation for sobriety on Jewish issues and at least relative fairness.

Many of those who had been inclined to a hesitant or inconsistent anti-Semitism before the war, such as Wilhelm II, now embraced more extreme opinions. Wilhelm's attitude to "the threat of international Jewry" was influenced by reports like those of Walther von Kaiserlingk, the German admiralty's chief of operations, who had visited Petrograd in the winter of 1917-18: He described the new government as run by Jews in the interest of Jews; it was "insanity in power," and it presented a moral threat not only to Germany but to the civilized world. Wilhelm agreed that the Russian people had been "turned over to the vengeance of the Jews, who are connected with all the Jews of the world."

We have seen how, in western countries where Jews experienced less oppression, an active and highly visible minority of them, especially young, secularized Jewish intellectuals in the generation before the war, were powerfully attracted to socialist ideas. Jews such as Hess, Marx, Lassalle, Bernstein, Otto Bauer, Luxemburg, Martov, Trotsky, and León Blum played a major role in formulating, refining, and propagating those ideas. Non-Jews (Engels, Kautsky, Bebel, Plekhanov, Lenin, Guesde, Jaurès) were also important, in many regards more important than Jews, but considering that the Jewish population of Europe was approximately 2 percent of the total, the Jewish participation in socialism, revolutionary and democratic, was remarkably large.

Both Jewish and non-Jewish socialists in the late nineteenth century saw great merit in the idealism and radicalism of a moral elite of Jews. Just as the non-Jew, Friedrich Engels, had praised Jews for their contribution to the socialist movement, so V.I. Lenin, in a speech in Zurich in 1905, observed that “the Jews furnished a particularly high percentage of leaders of the revolutionary movement. It should be noted to the credit of the Jews, they furnish a relatively high percentage of internationalists.” On another occasion Lenin, in lamenting the low moral and intellectual level of his compatriots, remarked to Maxim Gorky that “an intelligent Russia is almost always a Jew or somewhere with Jewish blood in his veins.” León Blum, who after his participation of the Dreyfus Affair went on to become a prominent figure in the French socialist movement, “glorified the messianic role of the Jews as social revolutionaries.” Although he was one of the most perceptive critics of Bolshevik theory in the debates within his own party in 1919 and 1920 concerning whether it should join the new Communist International, he had earlier written that “the collective impulse” of the Jews “leads them toward revolution; their critical powers... drive them to destroy every idea, every traditional form which does not agree with the facts or cannot be justified by reason.” Revolutionary socialism, he asserted, was a modern form of “the ancient spirit of the Jewish race.”

Most Russian Jews were pulled unwillingly, even uncomprehendingly into the vortex of revolution and ensuing civil war from 1917 to 1921, observers rather than actors. But others, especially many who had felt blocked in their dreams of a career or who had suffered daily under the irrationality and inefficiency of the tsarist regime, were only too understandably moved by a desire for violent revenge. Some of those revolutionaries, especially when driven into the moral anarchy of civil war, proved themselves capable of breath-taking ruthlessness.

Recognizing that there were fewer Jews in the Bolshevik faction than in the Menshevik, or even that Bolshevism was not a typically Jewish ideology, does not mean that the issue of the role of Jews in Bolshevism is settled, for there were still many Jewish Bolsheviks, especially at the very top of the party. And there were even more in the dreaded Cheka, or secret police, where the Jewish revolutionary became visible in a terrifying form.

Any effort to compose a list of the most important Bolsheviks must be unavoidable subjective, but it seems beyond serious debate that in the first twenty years of the Bolshevik Party the top ten to twenty leaders included close to a majority of Jews.

At a notch down in visibility was Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov. Described as “very Jewish looking,” he became secretary and main organizer of the Bolshevik Party in 1917. There was at any rate no little symbolism in the fact that a Jew was both the head of the state and the secretary of the ruling party. Percentages of Jews in state positions or in the party do not capture that adequately.

In approximately the same second-level category was Moisei Solomonovich Uritsky, notorious as the chief of the Cheka in Petrograd where Red Terror raged with special brutality. For anti-Semites he became the personification of “Jewish terror against the Russian people.” He was certainly less fanatical than Zinoviev⁵, whose pervasive cruelty and vindictiveness toward alleged counterrevolutionaries prompted Uritsky at one point to lodge an official complaint.

A list of prominent non-Jews in the party would begin with Lenin, whose name outweighs the others, although in the first year or so of the revolution, Trotsky’s name rivaled his. Yet his status as a non-Jew and “real Russian” is not as clear as subsequent Soviet propaganda tried to make it. His grandfather on his mother side was Jewish, though a convert to Christianity and married to a woman of German origin. On Lenin’s father side were Kalmyk and Swedish forebears. Lenin the non-Jew, in other words, was Jewish enough to have fallen under the shadow of doubt in Nazi Germany or to have been accepted in the state of Israel.

Lenin was of course considered jewified, if not exactly Jewish, by anti-Semites. As noted, he openly and repeatedly praised the role of the Jews in the revolutionary movement; he was one of the most adamant and consistent in the party in his denunciation of pogroms and anti-Semitism more generally. After the revolution, he backed away from his earlier resistance to Jewish nationalism, accepting that under Soviet rule Jewish nationality might be legitimate. On his death bed, Lenin spoke fondly of the Jewish Menshevik Julius Martov, for whom he had always retained a special personal affection in spite of their fierce ideological differences.

An even more remarkable case was Felix Dzerzhinsky, the head of the Cheka, a “non-Jewish Jew” in a different sense. (The destruction of his statue in front of the KBG building in Moscow in August 1991, after the ill-fated putsch by party conservatives, was widely seen as symbolic of the destruction of a hated past of secret police domination.) In origin a member of the Polish gentry, he had learned Yiddish as a young man in Vienna and had established close friendships with many Jews in the revolutionary circles of the town. He had several romances with Jews and finally married one.

The backgrounds and personal contacts of non-Jews such as Lenin, Kalinin, and Dzerzhinsky help explain how it was that so many observers believed the Bolsheviks were mostly Jews or were in some way under Jewish tutelage. The various refinements of Jewishness—traditional Jew, reform Jew, cultural Jew, half-Jew, non-Jewish Jew, self-hating Jew, Karaite, jewified Gentile—did not have much meaning to most of those who were in a life-and-death struggle with the Bolsheviks and who of course were not used to seeing Jews in any position of authority in Russia; to see them in such numbers spoke for some radical undermining of a previously accepted order. The leaders of the anti-

⁵ Another Jew. (Note of the Ed.)

Bolshevik White armies were convinced that they were fighting Jews and other foreigners (Georgians, Armenians, Lithuanians, Poles)—but most importantly Jews who had somehow seized control of Mother Russia. To most of the Whites the differences between the various revolutionary factions were of little importance; they all appeared alien, foreign in inspiration, jewified, and destructive. Indeed, for many on the right even the liberal Kadets were viewed as westernized and jewified.

Such exaggeration was hardly limited to the White armies. One book published in the West, *The Causes of World Unrest*, presented a list of fifty members of the Bolshevik government and declared that 95 percent of them were Jews, a common conclusion, as was the notion that the Bolsheviks were murderously destructive.

Destruction of the Jews by the Nazis was from this perspective to be considered a preventive measure, ultimately one of self-defense. As early as 1917, Belloc's friend and intellectual colleague, C.K. Chesterton, had sternly warned the Jews in Great Britain who were sympathetic to the revolution that "if they continue to incite people against the soldiers and their wives and widows, they will learn for the first time what anti-Semitism really means."

Anti-Semitism, well entrenched on the right, revived in the rest of the political spectrum, undermining what had been achieved through the patriotic unity of August 1914. The older charges that Jews were unpatriotic or part of the capitalist conspiracy now refocused on the Jew as a social subversive, "taking orders from Moscow."

A revolutionary unrest spread to central Europe in late 1918 and 1919. The party's first two leaders, Rosa Luxemburg and, after her murder in January 1919 at the hands of a right-wing paramilitary organization, Paul Levi, were of Jewish origin. Even in France and Italy, with their small and overwhelmingly bourgeois populations, the emerging Communist parties counted a number of Jews in hardship positions. "Foreign Jews, taking orders from Moscow" became an issue.

A Communist coup was attempted in Berlin in January 1919 (the Spartacus Uprising, when Rosa Luxemburg was killed), and in the course of that tumultuous year in Germany pro-Bolshevik revolutionaries took over, however briefly and confusedly, in Munich. In France a general strike was launched in the spring of 1920, and in the autumn of that year there were massive factory occupations in the industrial north of Italy. Perhaps most worrisome to the western powers, the Red Army, headed by Trotsky, launched an offensive against Poland in the summer of 1920 that was touted as the beginning of a triumphant advance of the Red Army into western Europe.

Russian Jews in Revolution. One of the first measures taken by the Provisional Government was a decree conferring complete civil equality upon Russia's Jews. That action was hailed

as long overdue by the Russian press; even *Novoe Vremia*, which, as a semiofficial organ before 1917, had often published anti-Semitic material, applauded the move.

Many of Russia's Jews were jubilant at the news. In some Jewish homes, Passover was celebrated that year with the reading of the decree instead of the traditional Haggada. Plans were quickly made by Jewish activists for an all-Russian Jewish congress. The excited appeal that went out for it proclaimed that whereas elsewhere Jews had received civil equality, only now in revolutionary Russia were they also going to receive recognition of their separate nationality *within* another nation. Nothing finally came of this congress, since the Bolshevik Revolution, and then civil war, got in the way.

In Russia, perhaps even more than elsewhere, civil equality for Jews, to say nothing of an official recognition of Jewish nationality, opened up Pandora's box. Jews who had faced pervasive discrimination and persecution suddenly found government positions opened to them while closed to the older privileged classes, who were overwhelmingly of Great Russian background. Still, after 1917, especially after November 1917, there was in Europe a most remarkable change in the status quo: Large numbers of individual Jews assumed, for the first time in modern history, a major role in the government of non-Jewish peoples. Such was the case not only in Russia but in other areas, most notably Hungary and Germany.

The Red Terror—a Jewish terror? In some areas, for example, the Ukraine, the Cheka leadership was overwhelmingly Jewish. By early 1919 Cheka organizations in Kiev were 75 percent Jewish, in a city where less than a decade earlier Jews had been officially forbidden to reside, except under special dispensation, and constituted about 1 percent of the total population.

The pattern of employing non-Slavic ethnic minorities in the Cheka was duplicated in many other areas of Russia. George Leggett, the most recent and authoritative historian of the Russian secret police, speculates that the use of outsiders may have been a conscious policy, since such "detached elements could be better trusted not to sympathize with the repressed local population."

It is instructive that the high percentage of Jews in the secret police continued well in the 1930s, when the population of Jews gradually diminished in most other areas of the Soviet and party cadres. The extent to which both Cheka and Gestapo leaders prided themselves in being an elite corps, characterized by unyielding toughness—unmoved by sympathy for their often innocent victims and willing to carry out the most stomach-turning atrocities in the name of an ideal—is striking.

The number of Jews involved in the terror and counterterror of this period is striking. These many Jewish terrorists helped to nurture, even when they killed Jewish Chekists, the

belief that Jews, especially once they had broken from the confines of their traditional faith, turned naturally to fanaticism and anarchistic destructiveness.

An even more important institution than the Cheka in defending the revolution was the Red Army, and, again, Jews played a key role in its leadership. Trotsky fascinated a broad public inside and outside Russia. In Hungary, a Jewish observer who was in fact hostile to the Bolsheviks nonetheless wrote: “The evolutionary flame which has burned beneath the surface of world history is now blazing up for the first time in a Jewish genius: Leo Trotsky!”

According to Paul Johnson,

It was Trotsky who personally organized and led the armed uprising which actually overthrew the Provisional Government and placed the Bolsheviks in power. It was Trotsky who created the Red Army, and who ensured the physical survival of the new Communist regime during the Civil War.

Trotsky’s paramount role in the revolution cannot be denied; Johnson’s views even if exaggerated, underline how powerful and durable has been the mystique around Trotsky’s name. He was second to Lenin, but a strong second. There was no Jew in modern times, at least until the creation of the state of Israel, to rival him.

It has been claimed that the actual proportion of Jews in top party and state positions in the 1930s did not notably drop from the 1920s. However, “visible” Jewish leaders, comparable to Trotsky, Zinoviev, or Uritsky, diminished in numbers and would continue to do so in subsequent years, so that by the mid-twentieth century there were almost no Jews among the highest officials in the Soviet Union.

To state the obvious, Jews were never purged explicitly as Jews in the Soviet Union, and millions survived the worst years of Stalin’s terror.

Excerpted from “Jews and Revolution (1917-1934)” in *Esau’s Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews* (Cambridge University Press, 2009): a subtitle that translated to Oldspeak should have said: “Jewish takeover (‘rise’) and Gentile reaction (‘anti-Semitism’)”.

On Hitler

by Ciaran

The greatest man yet to be born of the modern age has been slandered and vilified to the point where he has become the very symbol of evil. It fills me with despair when I reflect on the fact that the Anglo element of the Germanic population was tricked into sacrificing close to a million of its best young men to destroy the movement which had the potential to bring about our salvation.

—Hyperborean

He was a visionary, and a statesman—but no general. Jewish power is based on the slander, and inversion of real history about the events of the Twentieth Century. Hitler and the Nazis are the Trojan Horse, used to colonize the very minds of Western Whites. Hitler and the Nazis were not evil. You are blaming the victims. How dare you? They made a lot of mistakes—but Hitler was the last White Man that tried to defend his own people.

Every single time any one of you allows a lie to stand—you collude with our murderers. You may want to get rid of Hitler et al—but to allow the slander to stand is simply nothing more than laziness, and cowardice. How dare you?

Telling the truth about the real events of the Twentieth Century does not “keep White Nationalism in a ghetto”—it’s the laziness and timidity and cowardice that does that.

The Worst Generation fought against people who had done them no harm, actively participated in the Civil Rights dismantling of the Constitution and Bill of Rights, and did nothing to resist the 1965 Immigration Act, “Women’s Lib,” and the absolute degradation of the culture. The Worst Generation went along with everything, while they wallowed in what’s turning out to be rather short-term affluence.

The worst Generation did immense, civilization-wrecking harm. They set the stage for our genocide. They did wrong—for a host of reasons. And one wrong enabled another.

I'd like to ignore Hitler—but I'm not allowed to. The Jewish Media parades his demonized corpse around 24/7. I challenge any of you to turn on a radio, a TV set, open a magazine, or website, and not have poor old Adolf thrown right in your face. His name is invoked in the weirdest, and most unrelated situations. We will never be free of Hitler until we stop caving to the monstrous and fallacious demonization of Hitler.

This generation should be called out for what they've done. They should be ashamed of themselves. The ones that are around can still vote. Their shame should be held up as an example to future generations. The Founding Generation will feel repulsion of the deeds of the Worst Generation.

Adolf Hitler and the soldiers of the Reich did not bring death and destruction. Talmudic Jewry, and their vile Shabbos Goy sell-out whores, did that.

Refusing to accept this alienating and self-obliterating lie *is what sets us free*.

Flattering the soldiers of World War II as “The Greatest Generation” is one of Satan’s most beloved and successful tricks—cossetting human vanity. If that generation, and the succeeding generations, get hung up on that meme, that fraud, that con job, then it becomes more and more difficult to assess, with each passing day, the true, real-world legacy of that generation. Why do any of us want to lock ourselves into a mythos, created by our enemies, that leads directly to our dispossession and genocide, simply to flatter old men?

When I challenge these oldsters—and every last one of them is a Christian—I tell them: “I know it’s terrible to have to accept the fact that the ‘biggest’ event of your life was a terrible, horrible mistake. But you are going to have to deal with this when you face God—so get used to the idea now. Think about how you will account for this...”

These causal comments by Ciaran, originally posted in a January 21, 2012 thread on *The Occidental Observer*, have been edited for a more formal publication in this compilation.

Book review

Hellstorm: The Death of Nazi Germany, 1944–1947

by J. A. Sexton

What is hell? I've often pondered what the concept "hell" entailed; what it means to be living in the absence of "God," the supreme creative force behind all life. After reading Thomas Goodrich's breathtaking and physically nauseating analytical narrative of the burnt offering—Holocaust—of Germany I now know what hell looks like and how its inhabitants live and behave.

Relentless, reckless, and senseless hate of a magnitude so profound, so immense, that I am still unable to understand it. And then the irony of it all: that former inhabitants of *Europe—Europeans*—were responsible for inculcating hell in their own *Heimat* (homeland).

Who but the Devil itself could make a *family* turn on itself, causing it to tear itself apart in such a murderous, inhuman fashion that the victims are left unrecognizable after all the torture, abuse, burning, systematic rape, and beatings subsides?

Who or what could inspire such madness? Thomas Goodrich answers this question silently, subtly, but matter-of-factly—the Jews in Communist Russia (the former USSR) and Capitalist America and Britain.

Hellstorm is the type of book that changes lives. Goodrich is the type of author who literally puts you, the reader, there in the midst of hell. And what is this hell that he forces you to experience page after page, torture after torture, and rape after rape? One that has been all but forgotten; the only hell the modern age really knows:

The Allied Holocaust of National Socialist Germany. Goodrich describes the Allied-induced inferno in more detail than most need to know to gain an understanding of the depths of Allied criminality and hatred, but the detail is necessary. Without the detail no one will really know what hell is. Here's a taste of it.

A German woman has her jaws forced open by the filthy brutish hands of a Soviet serial rapist. He literally spits into her mouth and forces her to swallow his salivary filth as he rams her body again... and again... and again—until he's satisfied fulfilling his oath to Stalin and his chief Holocaust propagandist, Ilya Ehrenburg. Stalin officially sanctioned the systematic rape of German women. Ilya Ehrenburg, for his part as the lascivious advocate of rape of German women, helped the Red Army perpetrate the largest gynocide and mass rape in recorded history.

Commissar Ehrenburg's pamphlet—distributed in the millions among Red Army troops on the front lines of battle who were already intoxicated with hate and vengefulness as a result of over two decades of Bolshevik oppression, mass murder of their families and mass collectivization—urged Soviet troops to plunder, rape and kill. The final paragraph of his pamphlet entitled “Kill” reads:

The Germans are not human beings. From now on, the word “German” is the most horrible curse. From now on, the word “German” strikes us to the quick. We have nothing to discuss. We will not get excited. We will *kill*. If you have not *killed* at least one German a day, you have wasted that day... If you cannot *kill* a German with a bullet, then *kill* him with your bayonet. If your part of the front is quiet and there is no fighting, then *kill* a German in the meantime... If you have already *killed* a German, then *kill* another one—there is nothing more amusing to us than a heap of German corpses. Don't count the days, don't count the kilometers. Count only one thing: the number of Germans you have *killed*. *Kill* the Germans! *Kill* the Germans! *Kill!*

And in another leaflet:

The Germans must be *killed*. One must *kill* them... Do you feel sick? Do you feel a nightmare in your breast?... *Kill* a German! If you are a righteous and conscientious man—*kill* a German! *Kill!*

Ehrenburg, like any skilled propagandist with a penchant for revenge and training in human psychology, appealed to the basest instincts of his men, urging them to rape and wantonly slaughter other human beings at will. There would be no penalties for this injustice as it was all officially sanctioned. Ehrenburg:

Kill! Kill! In the German race there is nothing but evil; not one among the living, not one among the yet unborn but is evil! Follow the precepts of Comrade Stalin. Stamp out the fascist beast once and for all in its lair! *Use force and break the racial pride of these German women*. Take them as your lawful booty. *Kill!* As you storm onward, *kill*, you gallant soldiers of the Red Army.

The Gynocide. I went into Goodrich's book expecting to read little more than I already knew about the worst gynocide and mass rape of womankind in recorded history, but I was in for a shock. As an individual who looks out for women's interests, I was repeatedly overcome with emotion while reading of the indescribable genital mutilations, deliberate and systematic terrorism, gang-rape and wanton mass murder of women. Goodrich:

From eight to eighty, healthy or ill, indoors or out, in fields, on sidewalks, against walls, the spiritual massacre of German women continued unabated. When even violated corpses could no longer be of use, sticks, iron bars, and telephone receivers were commonly rammed up their vaginas. [p. 155]

Brazilian German Leonora Cavao:

"Suddenly I heard loud screams, and immediately two Red Army soldiers brought in five girls. The Commissar ordered them to undress. When they refused out of modesty, he ordered me to do it to them, and for all of us to follow him. We crossed the yard to the former works kitchen, which had been completely cleared out except for a few tables on the window side. It was terribly cold, and the poor girls shivered. In the large, tiled room some Russians were waiting for us, making remarks that must have been very obscene, judging from how everything they said drew gales of laughter. The Commissar told me to watch and learn how to turn the Master Race into whimpering bits of misery."

The horror that ensued nearly defies written description, as no written description can actually make a reader of either sex feel and genuinely know the pain and suffering inflicted in this neverending horror show. The victims' pain and suffering must have seemed like hours and hours... an entire lifetime... I can't imagine. I try not to imagine it because about 2,000 women in the Nemmersdorf area alone suffered a similar fate.

"Now two Poles came in, dressed only in their trousers, and the girls cried out at their sight. They quickly grabbed the first of the girls, and bent her backwards over the edge of the table until her joints cracked. I was close to passing out as one of them took his knife and, before the very eyes of the other girls, cut off her right breast. He paused for a moment, then cut off the other side. I have never heard anyone scream as desperately as that girl. After this operation he drove his knife into her abdomen several times, which again was accompanied by the cheers of the Russians."

Stop. Picture it. Imagine it. Live it.

Force yourself to see your own body mutilated in similar fashion; force yourself to picture a knife plunging into your abdomen again... and again... your short lifetime come to this end: you know you are about to die. You are being murdered; your body brutally tortured by a mob of brutal sadists. Try to imagine the horror and the helplessness you would feel as your person was mutilated and your very life bleeding away on a table.

Can a human being really suffer a worse injustice than this?

Now... step back out of the scene and analyze this needless, inhuman horror with the gift of hindsight. This victim was not just the victim of these Red Army men, reduced to base animal instinct and mentality, but she was also the victim of an ideology inspired by Judaism and a Jewish propagandist named Ilya Ehrenburg. Leonora:

The next girl cried for mercy, but in vain—it even seemed that the gruesome deed was done particularly slowly because she was especially pretty. The other three had collapsed, they cried for their mothers and begged for a quick death, but the same fate awaited them as well. The last of them was still almost a child, with barely developed breasts. They literally tore the flesh off her ribs until the white bones showed.

Loud howls of approval began when someone brought a saw from a tool chest. This was used to tear up the breasts of the other girls, which soon caused the floor to be awash in blood. The Russians were in a blood frenzy. More girls were being brought in continually.

I saw these grisly proceedings as through a red haze.

Leonora tried to dissociate from the situation, which is one of the brain's foremost methods for dealing with psychological and physical trauma. But to no avail, the Russian and Polish "soldiers" disallowed it.

Over and over again I heard the terrible screams when the breasts were tortured, and the loud groans at the mutilation of the genitals... It was always the same, the begging for mercy, the high-pitched scream when the breasts were cut and the groans when the genitals were mutilated. The slaughter was interrupted several times to sweep the blood out of the room and clear away the bodies... When my knees buckled I was forced onto a chair. The Commissar always made sure that I was watching, and when I had to throw up they even paused in their tortures. One girl had not undressed completely, she may also have been a little older than the others, who were around seventeen years of age. They soaked her bra with oil and set it on fire, and while she screamed, a thin iron rod was shoved into her vagina... until it came out her navel.

In the yard entire groups of girls were clubbed to death after the prettiest of them had been selected for this torture. The air was filled with the death cries of many hundred girls (pp. 156–57). And this is where I have to stop transcribing.

The Holocaust. The thought of being burned alive is horrific, but the thought of being burned alive because you are trapped in melted asphalt and literally stuck by your own disfigured hands and knees and screaming—in either agony or for salvation from passers-

by, or perhaps both—is worse; perhaps even worse than that is being boiled alive in the air raid shelters designed to keep you safe because steam pipes have burst open, unleashing their scorching wrath upon you—just one of millions of victims of Allied “morale bombing”: Victims of your own White racial brethren driven to absolute base madness and inhumanity by Jewish propagandists in the “liberal democracies.”

What did you do to be burned or boiled alive? What was your crime?

You supported Adolf Hitler, the man who dared to stand up to international finance and the Jewish system of systematic international monetary and spiritual enslavement.

That was your “crime” and the “crime” of millions of other “statistics” in Germany and Europe who were incinerated, melted, tortured, strafed, raped or blown into body parts by their own racial and cultural kindred in the USSR, Britain and America.

The core of the firestorms often reached 3,000 degrees Fahrenheit; the flames 1,300 to 1,800 degrees Fahrenheit. A Holocaust in the truest sense of the word: a burnt offering of the Germanic race—women, children, refugees, POWs, the elderly, and even animals at the Berlin Zoo—to the Christian-Jewish “god” Jahve. The truth is that this was the single largest burnt offering of human flesh to the Devil in recorded history. And for what? For what did hundreds of thousands of German victims suffer: international finance Capitalism.

So that a few people, mostly ethnic Jews, could continue to make money from money; so that a handful of international “bankers” could continue to enslave and exploit hundreds of millions of human beings.

Western man literally burnt and buried his collective spirit, soul and value system in Germany. Germany became the tomb of the West.

The Viricide. Systematic murder of German women and female Axis collaborators was not the only European gendercide from 1944 to 1950. German men and their Cossack and Slavic collaborators became deliberate targets of Anglo-Soviet viricide in the postwar years. German men and boys were reduced to corpses or skeletons by the millions in Eisenhower’s *Holodomor* (death by famine). Eisenhower’s camps were designed with one purpose in mind: mass death. Millions of German men and boys died from starvation, disease, exposure, heat exhaustion, thirst, and of course torture, slave labor, random massacre, and systematic execution. After having served in the worst war in Western history, and one of the worst in *world* history, German men came “home” to nothing more than rubble. Their wives, girlfriends, and children were dead, enslaved, mutilated, driven to madness, missing, lost, or had gone with the enemy to survive and prevent further systematic rape by Polish, Russian, and Mongolian “men.” There were very few “homes”

to return to, so thousands of men ended their lives in despair. They had survived six years of horror and warfare only to end it all in the street rubble once called “Germany.”

Why? Because their own blood kindred in America, Britain, the British Commonwealth, and even much of Europe had betrayed them: had turned on them to please their Jewish overlords.

The Spiritual Slaughter. Soviet tanks drive right over German refugees who have survived hell and come so close to salvation, or so they think, in the Allied occupation zone—more aptly described as the Allied destruction zone. The refugees are now just bloodied pulps in the snow, flattened like dough by the tank treks. The Soviet tanks trudge on without even so much as a pause. A German refugee ship capsizes after it is hit by a Soviet torpedo or bombed in an American air strike. All aboard scream and struggle to stay alive; they’ve made it so far, but the vast majority are forced to call the sea their final resting place. Bodies are everywhere in the water. There are literally thousands. Mothers, brothers, sisters, cousins, POWs, and even tiny infants who have just transitioned to life outside the womb and have breathed air for the first time—all dead in a matter of minutes. Some drowned. Many were crushed or torn apart by the rudders. Others froze to death. The sea was awash in human blood and body parts after each and every one of these attacks on refugee ships. No German was innocent. Not one.

This happened to *numerous* refugee ships. Many aboard were Allied POWs and Jewish camp refugees who had been protected by the fleeing German SS and *Wehrmacht* men—murdered by their own nation; murdered by their own race.

American pilots swoop down on exposed civilians and refugees in the vast clearing below. They open fire. They actually shoot individual human beings as though they are hunting wild horses or wolves in order to cull them. Machine gun bullets rip into the backs of civilians who had just barely escaped with their lives from the fiery Holocaust that was the city. The holes are the size of baseballs. Hundreds are mowed down instantly or are injured by the fire and debris—nearly all are left to die slow, agonizing deaths in that clearing. All the while Churchill and Roosevelt assure their self-absorbed, apathetic, hedonistic publics, *We do not shoot civilians. We do not target civilians.*

An older German woman is approached by filthy Soviet soldiers. She knows what awaits her because Goebbels did not lie. She tries to talk them out of it. She has children with her. They dispose of the children rapidly, viciously: their heads are rammed into the side of the building. The woman is gang-raped. What does she recall... the rape? No. The sound of a child’s skull when it is crushed against a wall. She’ll never forget that sound. Nor will I because I too can hear it. I too witnessed it. I witnessed it through Goodrich.

And then there were the death camps where over a million German men perished because Eisenhower hated Germans: “God I hate the Germans,” he said. His racism and hate became official policy, a policy of genocide—an American orchestrated *Holodomor*. Countless thousands of German men were shipped off to Britain and Siberia to serve as slave laborers for the “victors.” Victors of what? Total destruction. They aren’t paid and most die.

Most white American GIs rob the Germans, starve the Germans, plunder and destroy what remains of the German people’s homes, gang-rape German women, and beat and kill German children and honorable SS men. In the meantime most African GIs act kindly and distribute candy and food to German women and children. It is a bitterly confusing and deplorable world when the alleged “monsters” are the kind ones, and the members of your own race—*your own blood brethren*—act like deplorable beasts with no conscience. And yet this was the reality of Germany after 1945: an unpredictable dichotomy; an alien world.

While this horror is unfolding, Roosevelt (and later Truman) and Churchill cheerily offer Stalin half of Europe. They are more than happy to accommodate nearly every demand drafted up by this “Man of Steel.” The result of these Anglo accommodations nearly defies description: the greatest mass expulsion and deportation in history (upwards of 13 million); the mass murder of millions of Germans and their allies in Russian, French, Jewish, and Polish retribution camps and prisons dotted all throughout Europe and the USSR; the systematic mass rape and murder of German and collaborator women (an estimated two million); and the deliberate secret starvation of the Germanic race as spelled out by the Jewish advisor to Roosevelt and Truman, Henry Morgenthau.

The Toll. Between 20 and 25 million Germans and collaborators perished in the years *after* the war had officially ended. It is a crime that will never be forgotten, and it is a crime that will forever stain the hands and national consciences of the former USSR, the United States of America, Great Britain and her Commonwealth nations, and perhaps more pointedly the Anglo and Slavic races of the White supra-race.

A little German boy holds a lantern as he sits in a wagon en route to the Allied lines in the bitter winter snow. He’s with his mother. She’s bleeding profusely; she’s dying. The German doctor who the little boy was lucky enough to hunt down is doing his best to perform a tamponade (a blockage) of her uterus. She was brutally, viciously raped. Did she survive? Goodrich doesn’t say, but the prognosis and tone suggests she didn’t make it. She was a German. She supported Hitler. She was a Nazi. She deserved it. She deserved it.

So said the Allies in the years following the war: Germany merely got what she deserved. The “morally superior” White nations of the globe had smashed ultimate evil: the Nazis; the German race.

Never has a greater lie been told. Never has so much hatred and vengeance been poured forth onto one people and one nation that had chosen not to abide by the laws of international bankers and financiers who wish only to enslave, plunder, steal and when necessary, kill. And most of the White races of the world were more than willing and eager to take up the flag of international Jewish money power and to smash the one White race that opposed it with such honor, valor and sheer might—so much so that it took all the best brain- and material-power of the *entire* White supra-race and all the monetary power of its Jewish financiers and overlords to break its back. And yet... and yet... it *still* was not broken. Goodrich ends the book with a tone of hope.

Beyond Hell. When all had been destroyed, when all seemed to have been lost forever in *Year Zero*, the Germans proved once again that such was just not the case. Brick by brick and hour by hour they rebuilt upon the ruins of God's Empire a new Germany. No Holocaust by fire, no gynocide, no viricide, no famine, and no other inhuman atrocities could obliterate or subdue the Germanic element of the White race of humankind.

Even though Germany today is still an occupied nation with a hurting people, she still possesses that flicker of life and spirituality that the other White races and nations lost long ago when they sold their souls to Judaism and the Jewish "god" of hatred and revenge, Jahve. "Unbowed, unbent, unbroken." Such are the words of an album released by a European band named *Hammerfall*. And such are the words that describe the German people, the German folk, and the German race. The only ones who bear the burden of bloodstain and guilt are the Allies. No crimes in recorded human history surpass those inflicted against Germany and Europe by the United States, Great Britain and the former United Soviet Socialist Republics—all with Jewish spiritual, media and financial backing and support.

The death of National Socialist Germany was the death of Western man and everything he once stood for.


I must thank Thomas Goodrich. *Hellstorm* has changed my life.

Part II

The United States

On Yockey's America

by Michael O'Meara



The “Judeo-African cacophony” mesmerizing the jitterbugs on the dance floors of the Thirties was part of a larger program to debauch the conservative Christian rhythms of American life. Such at least was the argument Francis Parker Yockey made in his first published work, “The Tragedy of Youth” (1939).

In this early piece, full of promise and prefiguring aspects of his later critique of American life, the 22-year-old Yockey depicted an America whose youth had begun to keep step with the intonations and inflections of its Jewish bandmasters. Besides the folly of their un-European cavorting, Americans, he thought, were acting out the worldview of an alien-minded minority in control of the country’s media and entertainment. Drinking, smoking, and other bad habits glamorized by Hollywood became, in this spirit, marks of sophistication; sports were fetishized; public opinion was shaped and reshaped to legitimate machinations of every sort.

More seriously, God was “replaced by lust, the priest by the psychoanalyst, and the hero and heroine by the promiscuous lounge-lizard and the glittering harlot.” For the more educated, there were books and magazines promoting class war, racial equality, and anti-

European (especially anti-German) hatred—aimed at destroying “whatever exclusiveness, national feeling, or racial instinct” still part of the American people.

Institutionalizing these subversions, Roosevelt’s New Deal, the granddaddy of the present anti-white system, took on debts and obligations favoring the Left forces—themselves puppets of the international financiers and bankers responsible for the deception and dissimulation entrancing the jitterbugs.

Against this backdrop of cultural distortion, usurious state policy, and agitations favoring causes alien to American affairs, the country’s youth, Yockey claimed, was being conditioned to fight as conscripts in liberal, Jewish, and Communist causes inimical to their national interest.

The True America. Basic to Yockey’s understanding of America was his belief that it was, at root, an integral and organic part of Europe. Whenever he spoke of “the true America,” as opposed to the America that had been taken over by the “culture distorters” and become “the enemy of Europe,” it was the America that had originated as a European colony—the America whose “culture” was a branch of Europe’s High Culture—the America whose people still bore traces of the noble, heroic, and Gothic character of their ancestors.

“All colonials,” Yockey felt, “have a certain plane of their being which is susceptible to the centripetal attraction of the mother-soil.” For they share a common history with “the parent-organism”—no matter how much the distorters might insist otherwise.

The true American—i.e., the American whose highest loyalty was to his “mother soil and father culture”—thus instinctively isolated himself from all efforts to betray Europe: like French Canadians and South African Boers who refused to be conscripted by Washington in the Jews’ war against the Third Reich.

A child of European, especially German, culture, Yockey alone among American anti-liberals saw that America’s origin had tied its destiny to that of Europe, and that no matter how many cities the colony built, no matter how many millions of automobiles it turned out every season—no matter, even, how successful it was in reducing Europe to rubble and occupying it—no matter, it (the colony) would never, not in a thousand years, surpass the achievement and destiny of its mother soil and father culture.

To even think it was philosophically absurd.

The Culture of Distortion. Given their shallow culture and the dismissal of the tradition to which they were heirs, Americans were particularly vulnerable to the corrosions of 19th-century rationalism and materialism. Relatedly, they were an easy mark for “culture

aliens”—for a world governed by money was a world indifferent to a man’s qualities. Foremost among the culture-aliens were the Jews: product of Spengler’s “Magian” culture, instinctually hostile to the European spirit, and bent on revenge.

In their counting houses, Americans would invariably overlook the Jews’ otherness, though they were of a different “Culture-Nation-Race.” Even before the War of Independence, they treated Jews as Europeans—Jews who had been shunned, ghettoized, and seen by most Europeans as an evil to be avoided.

Beginning in the 1880s, the Jews (these inassimilable aliens rejected by Europe’s High Culture) began their invasion of America. By 1905, they were already a power, evident in fact that the United States, for the first time in its history, severed diplomatic relations with Russia on account of the “anti-Jewish pogroms” that had followed the Russo-Japanese War.

Through its financial acumen and early control of media (the press, movies, radio), and in alliance with the native forces of decadence and degeneration, Jewish power in the New World grew at an unprecedented rate.

In a country where “mass-thinking, mass-ideals, and mass-living prevails,” Jewish propaganda (in the form of advertising, fashion, and a hundred other things) effortlessly reshaped the American consciousness, propelling the jitterbugs onto the dance floor of their world-conquering schemes. Stories of German sadism or Orson Wells’ Mars invasion were peddled with similar success, just as “the ethical syphilis of Hollywood and the spiritual leprosy of New York” infiltrated the larger cultural body.

In 1933, the year of the European Revolution, the Jews acquired outright political control of the United States—something that a thousand years of effort had failed to achieve in Europe.

From this point forward, “the formation of the Jewish-American Symbiosis begins.” Swarming into Washington, Jews and their “sub-American” contractors started dissimulating the Jewish world view and “bringing under control every factor of public expression.”

All who resisted were to be purged or ostracized.

Then, as the country’s racial instincts were worn down by the distorters, America (in accord with the policies of its liberal state and in the programming of its Culture Industry) assumed “a Jewish countenance” in its relations both with the rest of the world and with itself.

For Yockey, Franklin Roosevelt, “the monster who made of his life a study in infamy,” was a creature of the Jews, just as his New Deal was bent on Judaifying American government and society, promoting, as it did, principles of tolerance and universal brotherhood, which were further developed by Rockefeller-funded social-engineers intent on morally disarming the American people.

In this, the prescient Yockey might be criticized for confusing Jewish supremacy with the increasing Judaification of American society (which Matthew Arnold had warned of in the 1860s), for Jewish power in America was arguably not consolidated until the late 1960s (even if its secular low-church market, in making money the ultimate standard, had already Judaicized American life and sentiments).

That Roosevelt, in October 1937, began to maneuver the United States into the coming world war and that this war would be a war of annihilation—i.e., the sort of war fought between racially and culturally alien, rather than related peoples sharing the same civilization—was further evidence, in Yockey’s eyes, of Jewish hegemony and the Jews’ genocidal hatred of Europe.

Despite a certain exaggeration of Jewish power in this period, Yockey was nearly alone in seeing that the United States had become an anti-European power bound to the Jews’ vengeful compulsion to suppress Europe’s destiny.

Unlike other American anti-liberals, anti-Semitism for him evolved, rapidly and logically, into an anti-Americanism.

The Enemy of Europe. As long as America had been ruled by men of European Christian stock, it remained “a European colony.” But the America “distorted by the Revolution of 1933” (a revolution carried out by the allegedly Jewish-dominated New Deal), was now lost to Europe.

America’s Jewified anti-Europeanism was especially evident in the Second World War and in its subsequent occupation of the Continent. For if the United States had possessed a proper ruling class, a tradition, and a regalian state, it would have stayed out of the Second World War, which became a defeat not just for Germany, but for all Europe—and thus, ultimately, a defeat for the true America.

Under its new Jewish-American regime, Washington after 1933 was instrumental in preparing the way for another European civil war—a war it would wage as if the enemy (their European kinsmen) weren’t human. Instead of being the great moral crusade against the absolute evil of fascism, the war in actuality represented a giant step toward the Judeo-plutocratic inauguration of a New World Order, based on American open markets and American economic practices.

To this end, American bombers (supported by their British vassals) reduced every German city to a heap of rubble, intentionally targeting heavily populated working-class residences—that is, “homes and families”; cities in France, Belgium, Holland, Italy, and Eastern Europe were also bombed, adding further hundreds of thousands of civilian casualties to US “kills”; American fighter-pilots similarly sought out civilians to machine-gun and terrorize; vast stores of equipment and armaments, often denied to American troops, were supplied to Soviet Russia to defend the Communist state and encourage its penetration into the heart of Europe; and throughout this most barbaric and punitive war in the white man’s history, the Washington regime talked incessantly of the enemy’s “war crimes” and its “inhumanity.”

Yockey blamed America’s dishonorable conduct in the war on the culture-distorters, whose “motivation derived from the deep and total organic irreconcilability between a High Culture and a parasitic organism” (though I suspect that the country’s latter-day Puritans, given their tendency to dehumanize the enemy, ought also to share a large part of the responsibility).

Even after the guns were silenced, America’s “ghastly dishonor” continued. With the Red Army occupying Eastern Europe and the US Army Western Europe, the looting, raping, pillaging—and ethnic cleansing—began.

The Soviets plundered everything not bolted down; the greatest mass rape in Western history occurred in what became “East Germany”; and 16 million East-European Germans were forced to abandon lands and homes they had inhabited for centuries, two million of whom (mainly the very old and the very young) perished in the process.

With greater discrimination, the Americans raided German patent offices, steeling their superior technology; they rounded up their rocket scientists, confiscated the libraries they hadn’t burned, and made off with priceless art works. German women, most on the verge of starvation, were not subject to mass rape (except by black American and French African troops), but their favors could be had for a half-dozen eggs, some cigarettes, or a few chocolate bars.

If this weren’t enough, the culture-distorters (whose “fury had been heightened by the European Revolution of 1933”), along with their American accomplices (especially the budding military-industrial complex), introduced large-scale starvation, abused POWs (several million of whom died as a consequence), hunted down anyone who failed to bow to the new conquerors, and imposed laws with *ex post facto* application.

Adding insult to injury, the “American world-clown and the sadistic Jew” then endeavored to “re-educate” Europeans in the arts of anti-fascism, mammon-worship, and democracy (i.e., “the corruptibility of the government by private wealth”).

The war for Yockey represented a categorical defeat for the “true America”—and a total victory for the Jews over Western Civilization.

Since 1945, the two sides of the Atlantic have ceased to share the same inner experience of feeling, for it was essentially a war against Europe. European Americans who supported it, Yockey contended, were traitors—inner enemies of their own culture.

Then, after being reduced to “a beggar colony of America,” Europe’s pre-1945 elites were replaced by “Michel elements” (liberal philistines embodying “the sum of European weaknesses”), who could be trusted to do the Jews’ bidding.

In the name of democracy, press rights and free speech were henceforth abrogated; political parties were required to obtain licenses; any expression of nationalism was criminalized, just as all anti-liberal formations critical of the occupiers’ regime were driven to the political fringe.

America-Jewry in this way sought to sever Europe’s roots, suppress her will to power, and deprive her of a sense of destiny.

In no meaningful political sense did Europe, in fact, continue to exist after 1945, thanks almost entirely to this monstrous entity with the Jewish head and the American body.

America-Jewry’s anti-European vengeance was especially evident in comparison to its generous treatment of defeated Japan.

Indeed, the entire nonwhite world was soon made to know that the United States had conquered Europe and that the colored outer-revolt, encouraged by the distorters, was ready, at last, to triumph over its former white masters. More than Soviet Communism, Yockey argued that Jewish-controlled America was the “enemy of Europe.”

And this made America an enemy of “true America,” for the Jewish idea of America—as a land of immigrants, creedal propositions, and universal brotherhood—stripped it of any “national-spiritual significance” it may have once had, doing so, ultimately, for “the enslavement of the world by big business.”

Every European-American loyal to his ancestral homeland—loyal to his own inmost being—was, Yockey concluded, duty bound to be disloyal to what America had become (even as he struggled to return it to Europe).

The American Vabanquespieler. Yockey believed the 19th-century Age of Materialism and Rationalism, which had shaped America’s cultureless civilization and opened the way to

the culture-distorters, came to an end with the First World War (1918), as a new age struggled to succeed it—a new age that would be animated by the same primordial sources that had brought about the European Revolution of 1933.

If not for America-Jewry's Old Testament war on Europe, German-Prussian Ethical Socialism (in rejection of liberalism's individualistic Reign of Quantity) would have inaugurated a New Age of Authority, Discipline, and Faith, bringing the whole world under Europe's influence. Instead, the very opposite occurred.

But even though the America of the culture-distorters had emerged victorious from the war, it changed not in the least the fact that America (this apotheosis of the 19th-century rationalism and materialism born of liberalism) still represented the past—and the past, Yockey held, could never defeat the future latent in Europe's High Culture.

The barbarian victory of America's 19th-century capitalism over the Germans' Ethical Socialism had, indeed, already spread chaos and disorder throughout Western Civilization, heightening the imperative for a revolutionary transformation.

Editor's note

Michael O'Meara is the penname of a North-American historian who has worked to introduce the thought of the European New Right in the English-speaking world. He is the author of *Toward the White Republic*. The above piece has been excerpted from O'Meara's "The Jitterbugs & the Vabanquespieler: On Yockey's America" (*Counter-Currents Publishing*, August 2013).

Heidegger on Americanism

by Michael O'Meara

In the Summer of 1942—while the Germans were at the peak of their powers, totally unaware of the approaching fire storm that would turn their native land into an inferno—the philosopher Martin Heidegger wrote (for a forth-coming lecture course at Freiberg) the following lines, which I take from the English translation known as *Hölderlin's Hymn "The Ister"*:⁶

"The Anglo-Saxon world of Americanism"—Heidegger noted in an aside to his nationalist/ontological examination of his beloved Hölderlin—*"has resolved to annihilate Europe, that is, the homeland, and that means: [it has resolved to annihilate] the commencement of the Western world."*

In annihilating the commencement (the origins or breakout of European being)—and thus in annihilating the people whose blood flowed in American veins—New World Europeans, unknowingly, destroyed the essence of their own being—by disowning their origins—denigrating the source of their life-form, denying themselves, thus, the possibility of a future.

"Whatever has commencement is indestructible."

Americans destined their self-destruction by warring on their commencement—by severing the root of their being.

But Europe—this unique synergy of blood and spirit—cannot be killed, for her essence, Heidegger tells us, is the "commencement"—the original—the enowning—the perpetual grounding and re-asserting of being.

Europe thus always inevitably rises again and again—like she and her bull from under the waters, which sweep over her, as she undauntedly plunges into what is coming.

⁶ Martin Heidegger, *Hölderlin's Hymn 'The Ister'*, trans. W. McNeill and J. Davis (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), p. 54ff.

Her last stand is consequently always her first stand—another commencement—as she advances to her origins—enowning the uncorrupted being of her beginning—as she authenticates herself in the fullness of a future which enables her to begin over and over.

The opposite holds as well. America's annihilation of her commencement revealed her own inherent lack of commencement. From the start, her project was to reject her European origins—to disown the being that made her who she was—as her Low Church settlers pursued the metaphor of Two Worlds, Old and New.

For Heidegger, America's *"entry into this planetary war is not [her] entry into history; rather, it is already, the ultimate American act of American ahistoricity and self-devastation."*

For having emerged, immaculately conceived, from the jeremiad of her Puritan Errand, America defined herself in rejection of her past, in rejection of her origins, in rejection of her most fundamental ontological ground—as she looked westward, toward the evening sun and the ever-expanding frontier of her rootless, fleeting future, mythically legitimated in the name of an "American Dream" conjured up from the Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism.

Americans, the preeminent rational, rootless, uniform *homo oeconomicus*, never bothered looking ahead because they never looked back. Past and future, root and branch—all pulled up and cut down.

No memory, no past, no meaning.

In the name of progress—which Friedrich Engels imagined as a "cruel chariot riding over mounds of broken bodies"—American being is dissolved in her hurly-burly advance toward the blackening abyss.

Yet however it is spun, it was from Europe's womb that Americans entered the world and only in affirming the European being of their Motherland and Fatherhood was there the possibility of taking root in their "New" World—without succumbing to the barbarians and fellaheen outside the Mother-soil and Father-Culture.

Instead, America's founders set out to reject their mother. They called her Egyptian or Babylonian—and took their identity—as the "elect," the "chosen," the "light to nations"—from the desert nomads of the Old Testament—alien to the great forests of our Northern lands—envious of our blue-eye, fair-hair girls—repelled by the great-vaulted heights of our Gothic Cathedrals.

The abandonment of their original and only being set Americans up as the perpetual fixers of world-improvement—ideological champions of consummate meaninglessness—nihilism's first great "nation."

While Heidegger was preparing his lecture, tens of thousands of tanks, trucks, and artillery pieces started making their way from Detroit to Murmansk, and then to the Germans' Eastern front.

A short time later, the fires began to fall from the sky—the fires bearing the curse of Cromwell and the scorched-earth convictions of Sherman—the fires that turned German families into cinders, along with their great churches, their palatial museums, their densely packed, sparkling-clean working-class quarters, their ancient libraries and cutting-edge laboratories.

The forest that took a thousand years to become itself perishes in a night of phosphorous flames. It would be a long time—it hasn't come yet—before the Germans—the People of the Center—the center of Europe's being—rise again from the rubble, this time more spiritual than material.

Heidegger could know little of the apocalyptic storm that was about to destroy his Europe. But did he at least suspect that the Führer had blundered Germany into a war she could not win? That not just Germany, but the Europe opposing the Anglo-American forces of Mammon would also be destroyed?

“The concealed spirit of the commencement in the West will not even have the look of contempt for this trial of self-devastation without commencement, but will await its stellar hour from out of the releasement and tranquility that belong to the commencement.”

An awakened, recommencing Europe promises, thus, to repudiate America's betrayal of herself—America, this foolish European idea steeped in Enlightenment hubris, which is to be forgotten (as a family skeleton), once Europe reasserts herself.

In 1942, though, Heidegger did not know that Europeans, even Germans, would soon betray themselves to the Americans, as the Churchills, Adenauers, Blums—Europe's lickspittle—rose to the top of the postwar Yankee pyramid designed to crush every idea of nation, culture, and destiny.

That's Europe's tragedy.

Once Europe awakes—it will one day—she will re-affirm and re-assert herself—no longer distracted by America's glitter and tinsel, no longer intimidated by her hydrogen bomb and guided missiles—seeing clearly, at last, that this entertainment worthy of Hollywood conceals an immense emptiness—her endless exercises in consummate meaninglessness.

Incapable therefore of beginning again, having denied herself a commencement, the bad idea that America has become is likely, in the coming age of fire and steel, to disintegrate into her disparate parts.

At that moment, white Americans will be called on, as New World Europeans, to assert their “right” to a homeland in North America—so that there, they will have a place at last to be who they are.

If they should succeed in this seemingly unrealizable fortune, they will found the American nation(s) for the first time—not as the universal simulacrum Masons and deists concocted in 1776—but as the blood-pulse of Europe’s American destiny.

“We only half-think what is historical in history, that is, we do not think it at all, if we calculate history and its magnitude in terms of the length... of what has been, rather than awaiting that which is coming and futural.”

Commencement, as such, is “that which is coming and futural”—that which is the “historical in history”—that which goes very far back and is carried forward into every distant, unfolding future—like Pickett’s failed infantry charge at Gettysburg that Faulkner tells us is to be tried again and again until it succeeds.

“We stand at the beginning of historicity proper, that is, of action in the realm of the essential, only when we are able to wait for what is to be destined of one’s own.”

“One’s own”—this assertion of ourselves—Heidegger contends, will only come if we defy conformity, convention, and unnatural conditioning to realize the European being, whose destiny is ours alone.

At that moment, if we should succeed in standing upright, in the way our ancestors did, we will reach ahead and beyond to what is begun through every futuristic affirmation of who we European-Americans are.

This reaching, though, will be no *“actionless or thoughtless letting things come and go... [but] a standing that has already leapt ahead, a standing within what is indestructible (to whose neighborhood desolation belongs, like a valley to a mountain).”*

For desolation there will be—in this struggle awaiting our kind—in this destined future defiantly holding out a greatness that does not break as it bends in the storm—a greatness certain to come with the founding of a European nation in North America—a greatness I often fear that we no longer have in ourselves and that needs thus to be evoked in the fiery warrior rites that once commemorated the ancient Aryan sky gods, however far away or fictitious they have become.

Editor's note

On *Counter-Currents Publishing* the above article was originally titled “Summer 1942, Winter 2010: an exchange.” When O’Meara writes about “...this a homeland in North America” he has in mind the coming ethnostate.

Homo Americanus

by Tomislav Sunic



Both the American and the Soviet experiments were founded on the same principles of egalitarianism... At the beginning of the third millennium, the immense egalitarian meta-narrative, encapsulated in Americanism, is very much alive... Both *Homo sovieticus* and *Homo americanus* herald the slogan that all men are created equal... All academic discussions about genetic or racial differences are quickly neutralized by the all-encompassing words such as “racism” or “hate speech. [pages 55-56]

Brainwashing the Germans. “Political correctness” is a euphemism for intellectual censorship whose legal and cultural origins can be traced to America and Europe, immediately after the Second World War. For the first time in European history, a large scale attempt was made by the victorious United States of America, the Soviet Union and their allies, to condemn a large number of thinkers and writers from defeated Germany and its allies to intellectual oblivion. Any criticism—however mild it may be—of egalitarianism and multiculturalism can earn the author or politician the stigma of “fascism,” or even worse, of “anti-Semitism.” How did this happen and who introduced this climate of intellectual censorship and self-censorship in America and Europe at the beginning of the third millennium?

In the aftermath of World War II, the role of the American-based Frankfurt School scholars and European Marxist intellectuals was decisive in shaping the new European

cultural scene. Scores of American left-leaning psychoanalysts—under the auspices of the Truman government—swarmed over Germany in an attempt to rectify not just the German mind but also change the brains of all Europeans. Frankfurt School activists were mostly of German-Jewish extraction who had been expelled by the German authorities during National Socialist rule and who, after the Second World War, came back to Europe and began laying the foundations for a new approach in the study of humanities.

But there were also a considerable number of WASP Puritan-minded scholars and military men active in post-war Germany, such as Major General McClure, the poet Archibald MacLeish, the political scientist Harold Laswell, the jurist Robert Jackson and the philosopher John Dewey, who had envisaged copying the American way of democracy into the European public scene. They thought of themselves as divinely chosen people called to preach American democracy—a procedure which would be used by American elites in the decades to come of each occasion and in every spot of the world. It never crossed the mind of American post-war educators that their actions would facilitate the rise of Marxist cultural hegemony in Europe and lead to the prolongation of the Cold War.

As a result of Frankfurt School reeducational endeavors in Germany, thousands of book titles in the fields of genetics and anthropology were removed from library shelves and thousands of museum artifacts were, if not destroyed in the preceding Allied fire bombing, shipped to the USA and the Soviet Union. The liberal and communist tenets of free speech and freedom of expression did not apply at all to the defeated side which had earlier been branded as “the enemy of humanity.”

Particularly harsh was the Allied treatment of German teachers and academics. Since National Socialist Germany had significant support among German teachers and university professors, it was to be expected that the US reeducational authorities would start screening German intellectuals, writers, journalists and film makers. Having destroyed dozens of major libraries in Germany, with millions of volumes gone up in flames, the American occupying powers resorted to improvising measures in order to give some semblance of normalcy in what later became “the democratic Germany.” The occupying powers realized that universities and other places of higher learning could always turn into centers of civil unrest, and therefore, their attempts at denazification were first focused on German teachers and academics...

Among the new American educators, the opinion prevailed that the allegedly repressive European family was the breeding ground of political neurosis, xenophobia, and racism among young children... Therefore, in the eyes of the American reeducational authorities, the old fashioned European family needed to be removed and with it some of its Christian trappings. Similar antifascist approaches to cultural purges were in full swing in Soviet-occupied Eastern Europe, but as subsequent events showed, the Western version of political correctness proved to be far more effective.

In the early postwar years the Americans and their war allies carried out large scale intellectual purges in the media, notably with issuing special licenses to newly launched newspaper outlets in Germany. The words “Nazism” and “Fascism” gradually lost their original meaning and turned, instead, into synonyms of evil. The new educational principle of *reduction ad hitlerum* became a new paradigm for studying social sciences. A scholar who would slightly diverge from these newly installed antifascist pedagogical methods would have meager chances for career advancement if not outright fired. In some cases, even sixty years after the end of World War II, he would have to face stiff penalties, including jail term. During the same postwar period in communist Eastern Europe, Soviet-led cultural repression was far more severe, but, ironically, its vulgar transparency, as seen in previous chapters, gave its victims an aura of martyrdom.

The ideology of antifascism became by the late 20th century a form of negative legitimacy for the entire West... Western European political elites went a step further; in order to show to their American sponsors democratic credentials and their philo-Semitic attitudes, they introduced strict legislation forbidding historical revisionism of the Second World War and any critical study of mass immigration into Western Europe.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the whole intellectual climate in America and especially in Europe came to resemble the medieval period by forbidding critical inquiry into “self-evident truths”... The German Criminal Code appears in substance more repressive than the former Soviet Criminal Code. Day after day Germany has to prove that it can perform self-educational tasks better than its American tutor. It must show signs of being the most servile disciple of the American hegemon, given that the “transformation of the German mind (was) the main home work of the military regime.” If one wishes to grasp the concept of modern political correctness, one must study in detail the political psychology of the traumatized German people...

Given that all signs of nationalism, let alone racialism, are reprimanded in Germany... it is considered legally desirable to hunt down European heretics... Germany, along with other European countries, has now evolved into a “secular theocracy”... Similar to Communism, historical truth in Western Europe is not established by an open academic debate but by state legislation... Thus the ruling class in America and Europe successfully resorts to the scarecrow of debate stopping words, such as “anti-Semitism” and “Neo-Nazism,” as an alibi for legitimizing its perpetual status quo.

The specter of a projected catastrophic scenario must silence all free spirits. Naturally, if fascism is legally decreed as absolute evil, any aberration in the liberal system will automatically appear as a lesser evil. The modern liberal system, which originated in America, functions as a self-perpetuating machine of total mind control.

The proportion of writers and journalists who were shot, imprisoned, and barred from their profession surpasses all other professional categories. Do we need to be reminded of the assassination of Albert Clément, Philippe Henriot, Robert Denoël, of the suicide of Drieu La Rochelle, of the death of Paul Allard in prison prior to court hearings and of the executions of Georges Suarez, Robert Brasillach, Jean Luchaire... the death sentence pronounced in absentia or a commuted prison sentence for Lucien Rebatet, Pierre-Antoine Cousteau, etc.? The targets were the providers of the ideas more than the entrepreneurs who had contributed to the German war industry. By 1944 the professional interdiction by the CNE (*Comité nationale des écrivains*) targeted approximately 160 journalists and writers. [Dominique Venner, *Histoire de la Collaboration* (Paris: Pygmalion, 2000), pp. 515-516]

After the Second World War an *ex post facto* law was adopted in France, making some political opinions a crime... The defendants are not blamed for their acts—provided there were any—but for their ideas. At the beginning of the 21st century, as a result of this repressive intellectual climate of Europe, hundreds of French and German authors showing sympathies for anti-liberal authors or who voice criticism of multicultural experiments in postmodern Europe or America are subject to legal sanctions and public ostracism...

It is true that Western Europe, unlike Eastern Europe, could escape the naked terror of communism, although Western Europe's own subspecies, the *antifascist homunculi*, as German scholar Günther Maschke derogatorily calls modern Americanized opinion makers in Europe, tirelessly watch for any sign of nationalist revival... One wonders, why does not the Communist criminal legacy trigger a similar negative outcry in the wider public as the fascist legacy? Why must the public stay tuned to endless recitals of National Socialist crimes, whereas rarely ever does it have an opportunity to hear something about Communist horrors?

The larger public in America and Europe have little knowledge that in Germany alone, in the last decade of the 20th century, thousands of individuals, ranging from German youngsters cracking jokes about non-European immigrants, to scholars dealing critically with the Jewish Holocaust, have been sentenced to either fines or to considerable prison terms. In the political and academic environment, writes the modern German heretic Germar Rudolf, it must, therefore, not come as a surprise that "political scientists, sociologists and historians do not wish to call things by their names."

The spiral of intellectual cowardice only reinforces the Americanized system's thought control. The silence of American academics and prominent human rights advocates, following the arrest of Rudolf in America, proves time and again that American intellectuals realize that there must be limits to their freedom of speech... The American brain child, the post-war Federal Republic of Germany, might enter some day into history books as the most bizarre system ever seen in Europe.

The Biblical origins of American fundamentalism. America is a land of the Bible. In America, it is virtually unheard of to openly declare oneself an agnostic or an atheist and to aspire at the same time to some high political office. No country on earth has ever known such a high degree of Biblical influence as the United States of America.

The legacy of Biblical Puritanism lost its original theological God-fearing message and adopted, at the turn of the 20th century, a secular neo-liberal form of the human rights gospel. Subsequently, by a bizarre twist of fate, the Calvinist legacy of Puritanism that had been chased from Europe by the end of the 17th century started its journey back home to Europe—particularly after America came out victorious after the Second World War. Although Europe remains a much less Bible-oriented society than America, the moralistic message, as an old Bible derivative, is making strong headways in the postmodern European social arena. However much the surface of America shows everywhere signs of secularism, rejecting the Christian dogma and diverse religious paraphernalia, in the background of American political thought always looms the mark of the Bible.

In hindsight, the British context of the 17th century, the strongest political standard bearer of Puritanism, Oliver Cromwell, appears as a passing figure who did not leave a lasting political impact on the future of the United Kingdom or on the rest of continental Europe. Yet Cromwell's unwitting political legacy had more influence on the American mindset than Lenin's rhetoric did on the future of communized Russia...

In contrast to European Catholicism and Lutheranism, Calvinist Puritanism managed to strip Christianity of pagan elements regarding the transcendental and the sacred, and reduced the Christian message solely to the basic ethical precepts of good behavior. American Puritanism deprived Christianity of its aesthetic connotations and symbolism, thereby alienating American Christians as well as American cultural life in general, further from its European origins. In this way, Americans became ripe for modernism in architecture and new approaches in social science... This hypertrophy of moralism had its birth place in New England during the early reign of the Pilgrim fathers, which only proves our thesis that New England and not Washington D.C. was the birth place of Americanism...

It was to be expected with the Puritans' idea of self-chosenness that Americans took a special delight in the Old Testament. From it, almost exclusively, they drew their texts, and it never failed to provide them with justification for their most inhuman and bloodthirsty acts. Their God was the God of the Old Testament; their laws were the laws of the Old Testament. Their Sabbath was Jewish, not Christian...

"Judeo-American" monotheism. American founding myths drew their inspiration from Hebrew thought. The notion of the "City on the Hill" and "God's own country" were borrowed

from the Old Testament and the Jewish people... Of all Christian denominations, Calvinism was the closest to the Jewish religion and as some authors have noted, the United States owns its very existence to the Jews. “For what we call Americanism,” writes Werner Sombart, “is nothing else than the Jewish spirit distilled.” Sombart further writes that “the United States is filled to the brain with the Jewish spirit”...

Very early on America’s founding fathers, pioneers, and politicians identified themselves as Jews who had come to the new American Canaan from the pestilence of Europe. In a postmodern Freudian twist, these pilgrims and these new American pioneers were obliged to kill their European fathers in order to facilitate the spreading of American democracy world-wide. “Heaven has placed our country in this situation to try us; to see whether we would faithfully use the incalculable power in our hands for spreading forward the world’s regeneration”...

Does that, therefore, mean that our proverbial *Homo americanus* is a universal carbon copy of *Homo judaicus*? The word “anti-Semite” will likely be studied one day as a telling example of postmodern political discourse, i.e. as a signifier for somebody who advocates the reign of demonology... How does one dare critically talk about the predominance of the Judeo-American spirit in America without running the risk of social opprobrium or of landing into psychiatric asylum, as Ezra Pound once did?...

Eventually, both American Jews and American Gentiles will be pitted into an ugly clash from which there will be no escape for any of them... It is the lack of open discussion about the topic of the Jews that confirms how Jews play a crucial role in American conscience building, and by extension, in the entire West. But contrary to classical anti-Semitic arguments, strong Jewish influence in America is not only the product of Jews; it is the logical result of Gentiles’ acceptance of the Jewish founding myths that have seeped over centuries into Europe and America in their diverse Christian modalities. Postmodern Americanism is just the latest secular version of the Judean mindset. Blaming American Jews for extraterrestrial powers and their purported conspiracy to subvert gentile culture borders on delusion and only reflects the absence of dialogue...

One can naturally concur that Americans are influenced by Jews, but then the question arises as to how did it happen? Jews in America did not drop from the moon. Jewish social prominence, both in Europe and America, has been the direct result of the white Gentile’s acceptance of Jewish apostles—an event which was brought to its perfection in America by early Puritan Pilgrim Founding Fathers. Be it in Europe or in the USA, Christian religious denominations are differentiated versions of Jewish monotheism. Therefore, the whole history of philo-Semitism, or anti-Semitism in America and in Europe, verges on serious social neurosis.

American pro-Jewish or “Jewified” intellectuals often show signs of being more Jewish than Jews themselves... As the latest version of Christianized and secularized

monotheism, Judeo-Americanism represents the most radical departure from the ancient European pre-Christian *genius loci*. Christian anti-Semites in America often forget, in their endless lamentation about the changing racial structure of America, that Christianity is by definition a universal religion aiming to achieve a pan-racial system of governance. Therefore, Christians, regardless whether they are hypermoralistic Puritans or more authority prone Catholics, are in no position to found an ethnically and racially all white Gentile society while adhering at the same time to the Christian dogma of pan-racial universalism.

The West, and particularly America, will cease to be Israelite once it leaves this neurosis, once it returns to its own local myths. Many Jewish scholars rightly acknowledge deep theological links between Americanism and Judaism. Also, American traditionalists and conservatives are correct in denouncing secular myths, such as Freudism, Marxism, and neo-liberalism which they see as ideologies concocted by Jewish and pro-Jewish thinkers. They fail to go a step further and examine the Judaic origins of Christianity and the mutual proximity of these two monotheist religions that make up the foundations of the modern West. Only within the framework of Judeo-Christianity can one understand modern democratic aberrations and the proliferation of new civic religions in postmodernity.

Also, the reason America has been so protective of the state of Israel has little to do with America's geopolitical security. Rather, Israel is an archetype and a pseudo-spiritual receptacle of American ideology and its Puritan founding fathers. Israel must function as America's democratic Super-Ego.

Modern individuals who reject Jewish influence in America often forget that much of their neurosis would disappear if their Biblical fundamentalism was abandoned. One may contend that the rejection of monotheism does not imply a return to the worship of ancient Indo-European deities or the veneration of some exotic gods and goddesses. It means forging another civilization, or rather, a modernized version of scientific and cultural Hellenism, considered once as a common receptacle of all European peoples.

In short, Judeo-Christian universalism, practiced in America with its various multicultural and secular offshoots, set the stage for the rise of postmodern egalitarian aberrations and the complete promiscuity of all values. That Americanism can also be a fanatical and intolerant system "without God," is quite obvious. This system, nonetheless, is the inheritor of a Christian thought in the sense in which Carl Schmitt demonstrated that the majority of modern political principles are secularized theological principles...

America is bound to become more and more a racial pluriverse. Guilt feelings inspired in the Bible, along with the belief in economic progress and the system of big business, pushed America onto a different historical path of no return.

Undoubtedly, many American atheists and agnostics also admit that in the realm of ethics all men and women of the world are the children of Abraham. Indeed even the bolder ones who somewhat self-righteously claim to have rejected Christian or Jewish theologies, and who claim to have replaced them with “secular humanism,” frequently ignore the fact that their self-styled secular beliefs are also grounded in Judeo-Christian ethics. Abraham, Jesus and Moses may be dethroned today, but their moral edicts and spiritual ordinances are much alive in American foreign policy. “The pathologies of the modern world are genuine, albeit illegitimate daughters of Christian theology,” writes De Benoist.

Who can dispute the fact that Athens was the homeland of European America before Jerusalem became its painful edifice?

A war crime of the Bible. It was largely the Biblical message which stood as the origin of America’s endeavor to “make the world safe for democracy.” Contrary to many European observers critical of America, American military interventions have never had as a sole objective economic imperialism but rather the desire to spread American democracy around the world.

American involvement in Europe during World War II and the later occupation of Germany were motivated by America’s self-appointed do-gooding efforts and the belief that Evil in its fascist form had to be removed, whatever the costs might be. Clearly, Hitler declared war on “neutral” America, but Germany’s act of belligerence against America needs to be put into perspective. An objective scholar must examine America’s previous illegal supplying of war material to the Soviet Union and Great Britain. Equally illegal under international law was America’s engaging German submarines in the Atlantic prior to the German declaration of war, which was accompanied by incessant anti-German media hectoring by American Jews—a strategy carried out in the name of a divine mission of “making the world safe for democracy.”

In the first half of the 20th century American Biblical fundamentalism resulted in military behavior that American postmodern elites are not very fond of discussing in a public forum. It is common place in American academia and the film industry to criticize National Socialism for its real or alleged terror. But the American way of conducting World War II—under the guise of democracy and world peace—was just as violent if not even worse.

Puritanism had given birth to a distinctive type of American fanaticism which does not have parallels anywhere else in the world. Just as in 17th century England, Cromwell was persuaded that he had been sent by God Almighty to purge England of its enemies; so did his American liberal successors by the end of the 20th century think themselves elected in order to impose their own code of military and political conduct in both domestic and

foreign affairs. M.E. Bradford notes that this type of Puritan self-righteousness could be easily observed from Monroe to Lincoln and Lincoln's lieutenants Sherman and Grant...

Whereas everybody in American and European postmodern political establishment are obliged to know by heart the body count of Fascist and National Socialist victims, nobody still knows the exact number of Germans killed by American forces during and after World War II. Worse, as noted earlier, a different perspective in describing the US post-war foreign policy toward Europe and Germany is not considered politically correct.

Just as communism, following the Second World War, used large scale terror in the implementation of its foreign policy goals in Eastern Europe, so did America use its own type of repression to silence heretics in the occupied parts of postwar Europe. The American crusade to extirpate evil was felt by Germans in full force in the aftermath of World War II. Freda Utey, an English-American writer depicts graphically in her books the barbaric methods applied by American military authorities against German civilians and prisoners in war ravaged Germany. Although Utey enjoyed popularity among American conservatives, her name and her works fell quickly into oblivion.

In hindsight one wonders whether there was any substantive difference between warmongering Americanism and Communism? If one takes into account the behavior of American military authorities in Germany after World War II, it becomes clear why American elites, half a century later, were unwilling to initiate a process of decommunisation in Eastern Europe, as well as the process of demarxisation in American and European higher education. After all, were not Roosevelt and Stalin war time allies? Were not American and Soviet soldiers fighting the same "Nazi evil"?

It was the inhumane behavior of the American military interrogators that left deep scars on the German psyche and which explains why Germans, and by extension all Europeans, act today in foreign affairs like scared lackeys of American geopolitical interests.

A whole fleet of aircraft was used by General Eisenhower to bring journalists, Congressmen, and churchmen to see the concentration camps; the idea being that the sight of Hitler's starved victims would obliterate consciousness of our own guilt. Certainly it worked out that way. No American newspaper of large circulation in those days wrote up the horror of our bombing or described the ghastly conditions in which the survivors were living in the corpse-filled ruins. American readers sipped their fill only of German atrocities. [Freda Utey, *The High Cost of Vengeance* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1949), p. 183]

Utey's work is today unknown in American higher education although her prose constitutes a valuable document in studying the crusading and inquisitorial character of Americanism in Europe. There are legions of similar revisionist books on the topic describing the plight of Germans and Europeans after the Second World War, but due to

academic silence and self-censorship of many scholars, these books do not reach mainstream political and academic circles. Moreover, both American and European historians still seem to be light years away from historicizing contemporary history and its aftermath. This is understandable, in view of the fact that acting and writing otherwise would throw an ugly light on crimes committed by the Americans in Germany during and after the second World War and would substantially ruin antifascist victimology, including the Holocaust narrative.

American crimes in Europe, committed in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, included extra-killings of countless German civilians and disarmed soldiers, while tacitly approving serial Soviet genocides and mass expulsions of the German civilian population in Eastern Europe... As years and decades went by, crimes committed by the Americans against the Germans were either whitewashed or ascribed to the defeated Germans.

The number of German dead varies wildly, ranging from 6 to 16 million Germans, including civilians and soldiers. It is only the fascist criminology of World War II, along with the rhetorical projection of the evil side of the Holocaust that modern historiographers like to repeat, with Jewish American historians and commentators being at the helm of this narrative. Other victimhoods and other victimologies, notably those people who suffered under communism, are rarely mentioned. According to some German historians over a million and a half of German soldiers died *after* the end of hostilities in American and Soviet-run prison camps...

The masters of discourse in postmodern America have powerful means to decide the meaning of historical truth and provide the meaning with their own historical context. Mentioning extensively Germany's war loses runs the risk of eclipsing the scope of Jewish war loses, which makes many Jewish intellectuals exceedingly nervous. Every nation likes to see its own sacred victimhood on the top of the list of global suffering. Moreover, if critical revisionist literature were ever to gain a mainstream foothold in America and Europe, it would render a serious blow to the ideology of Americanism and would dramatically change the course of history in the coming decades.

Excerpted from Tom Sunic's
Homo Americanus: Child of the Postmodern Age (2007).

Part III

Christian axiology

The Christian problem - I

“Christian is a codeword for
artificial Jew.”

Anonymous

From the editor's desk

David Irving, the famed historian of the Third Reich, wrote:

The *Table Talk*'s content is more important in my view than Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, and possibly even more than his *Zweites Buch* (1928). It is unadulterated Hitler. He expatiates on virtually every subject under the sun, while his generals and private staff sit patiently and listen, or pretend to listen, to the monologues.

The following article reproduces my chosen excerpts from the book collecting Hitler's private talks, originally written in shorthand. The book has been translated to English and is a must reading to understand the historical Hitler in contrast to the pseudo-Hitler we have seen for many decades in the media, the academia and Hollywood.

The first excerpt was taken from what Hitler said in a night of July of 1941. I omitted ellipsis between unquoted sentences as I did in my previous quotations of Tom Sunic's book.

Hitler on Christianity



*Hitler's Table Talk, 1941-1944:
His Private Conversations
Part I: 1941*

The heaviest blow that ever struck humanity was the coming of Christianity. Bolshevism is Christianity's illegitimate child. Both are inventions of the Jew. The deliberate lie in the matter of religion was introduced into the world by Christianity. Bolshevism practises a lie of the same nature, when it claims to bring liberty to men, whereas in reality it seeks only to enslave them. In the ancient world, the relations between men and gods were founded on an instinctive respect. It was a world enlightened by the idea of tolerance. Christianity was the first creed in the world to exterminate its adversaries in the name of love. Its key-note is intolerance.

Without Christianity, we should not have had Islam. The Roman Empire, under Germanic influence, would have developed in the direction of world-domination, and humanity would not have extinguished fifteen centuries of civilisation at a single stroke.

14th October 1941, midday
Special Guest: Reichsführer Himmler

It may be asked whether concluding a concordat with the churches wouldn't facilitate our exercise of power. I'm convinced that any pact with the Church can offer only a provisional benefit, for sooner or later the scientific spirit will disclose the harmful character of such a compromise. Thus the State will have based its existence on a foundation that one day will collapse.

That's why I've always kept the Party aloof from religious questions. I've thus prevented my Catholic and Protestant supporters from forming groups against one another, and inadvertently knocking each other out with the Bible and the sprinkler. So we never became involved with these Churches' forms of worship. And if that has momentarily made my task a little more difficult, at least I've never run the risk of carrying grist to my opponents' mill. The help we would have provisionally obtained from a concordat would have quickly become a burden on us. In any case, the main thing is to be clever in this matter and not to look for a struggle where it can be avoided.

So it's not opportune to hurl ourselves now into a struggle with the Churches. The best thing is to let Christianity die a natural death. A slow death has something comforting about it. The dogma of Christianity gets worn away before the advances of science. Religion will have to make more and more concessions. Gradually the myths crumble.

* * *

It seems to me that nothing would be more foolish than to re-establish the worship of Wotan. Our old mythology had ceased to be viable when Christianity implanted itself. Nothing dies unless it is moribund. At that period the ancient world was divided between the systems of philosophy and the worship of idols. It's not desirable that the whole of humanity should be stultified—and the only way of getting rid of Christianity is to allow it to die little by little.

Science cannot lie, for it's always striving, according to the momentary state of knowledge, to deduce what is true. When it makes a mistake, it does so in good faith. It's Christianity that's the liar. It's in perpetual conflict with itself.

One may ask whether the disappearance of Christianity would entail the disappearance of belief in God. That's not to be desired. The notion of divinity gives most men the opportunity to concretise the feeling they have of supernatural realities. Why should we

destroy this wonderful power they have of incarnating the feeling for the divine that is within them?

I envisage the future, therefore, as follows: First of all, to each man his private creed. Superstition shall not lose its rights. We'll see to it that the Churches cannot spread abroad teachings in conflict with the interests of the State. We shall continue to preach the doctrine of National Socialism, and the young will no longer be taught anything but the truth.

21st October 1941, midday

When one thinks of the opinions held concerning Christianity by our best minds a hundred, two hundred years ago, one is ashamed to realise how little we have since evolved. I didn't know that Julian the Apostate had passed judgment with such clear-sightedness on Christianity and Christians. You should read what he says on the subject.

Nevertheless, the Galilean, who later was called the Christ, intended something quite different. He must be regarded as a popular leader who took up his position against Jewry. The decisive falsification of Jesus' doctrine was the work of St. Paul. He gave himself to this work with subtlety and for purposes of personal exploitation.

On the road to Damascus, St. Paul discovered that he could succeed in ruining the Roman State by causing the principle to triumph of the equality of all men before a single God—and by putting beyond the reach of the laws his private notions, which he alleged to be divinely inspired. If, into the bargain, one succeeded in imposing one man as the representative on earth of the only God, that man would possess boundless power.

Nobody was more tolerant than the Romans. Every man could pray to the god of his choice, and a place was even reserved in the temples for the unknown god. Moreover, every man prayed as he chose, and had the right to proclaim his preferences. St. Paul knew how to exploit this state of affairs in order to conduct his struggle against the Roman State. Nothing has changed; the method has remained sound.

The religious ideas of the Romans are common to all Aryan peoples. The Jew, on the other hand, worshipped and continues to worship, then and now, nothing but the golden calf. The Jewish religion is devoid of all metaphysics and has no foundation but the most repulsive materialism.

It's since St. Paul's time that the Jews have manifested themselves as a religious community, for until then they were only a racial community. St. Paul was the first man to take account of the possible advantages of using a religion as a means of propaganda. If

the Jew has succeeded in destroying the Roman Empire, that's because St. Paul transformed a local movement of Aryan opposition to Jewry into a supra-temporal religion, which postulates the equality of all men amongst themselves, and their obedience to an only god. This is what caused the death of the Roman Empire.

It's striking to observe that Christian ideas, despite all St. Paul's efforts, had no success in Athens. The philosophy of the Greeks was so much superior to this poverty-stricken rubbish that the Athenians burst out laughing when they listened to the apostle's teaching. But in Rome St. Paul found the ground prepared for him. His egalitarian theories had what was needed to win over a mass composed of innumerable uprooted people.

Whilst Roman society proved hostile to the new doctrine, Christianity in its pure state stirred the population to revolt. Rome was Bolshevised, and Bolshevism produced exactly the same results in Rome as later in Russia.

Yesterday, the instigator was Saul: the instigator to-day, Mardochai. Saul has changed into St. Paul, and Mardochai into Karl Marx. By exterminating this pest, we shall do humanity a service of which our soldiers can have no idea.

*25th October 1941, evening
Special Guests: Reichsführer SS Himmler
and SS General Heydrich*

From the rostrum of the Reichstag I prophesied to Jewry that, in the event of war's proving inevitable, the Jew would disappear from Europe. That race of criminals has on its conscience the two million dead of the First World War, and now already hundreds of thousands more. Let nobody tell me that all the same we can't park them in the marshy parts of Russia! Who's worrying about our troops? It's not a bad idea, by the way, that public rumour attributes to us a plan to exterminate the Jews. Terror is a salutary thing. The attempt to create a Jewish State will be a failure.

People only retain from the past what they want to find there. As seen by the Bolshevik, the history of the Tsars seems like a blood-bath. But what is *that*, compared with the crimes of Bolshevism?

There exists a history of the world, compiled by Rotteck, a liberal of the 1840s, in which facts are considered from the point of view of the period; antiquity is resolutely neglected. We, too, shall re-write history, from the racial point of view. Starting with isolated examples, we shall proceed to a complete revision. It will be a question not only of studying the sources, but of giving facts a logical link.

What a certificate of mental poverty it was for Christianity that it destroyed the libraries of the ancient world! Graeco-Roman thought was made to seem like the teachings of the Devil.

Christianity set itself systematically to destroy ancient culture. What came to us was passed down by chance, or else it was a product of Roman liberal writers. Perhaps we are entirely ignorant of humanity's most precious spiritual treasures. Who can know what was there?

Night of 1st December 1941

I'm convinced that there are Jews in Germany who've behaved correctly—in the sense that they've invariably refrained from doing injury to the German idea. It's difficult to estimate how many of them there are, but what I also know is that none of them has entered into conflict with his co-racialists in order to defend the German idea against them.

Probably many Jews are not aware of the destructive power they represent. Now, he who destroys life is himself risking death. That's the secret of what is happening to the Jews.

This destructive rôle of the Jew has in a way a providential explanation. If nature wanted the Jew to be the ferment that causes peoples to decay, thus providing these peoples with an opportunity for a healthy reaction, in that case people like St. Paul and Trotsky are, from our point of view, the most valuable. By the fact of their presence, they provoke the defensive reaction of the attacked organism. Dietrich Eckart once told me that in all his life he had known just one good Jew: Otto Weininger, who killed himself on the day when he realised that the Jew lives upon the decay of peoples.

*13th December 1941, midday
Special Guests: Ribbentrop, Rosenberg, Goebbels,
Terboven and Reichsleiter Buhler*

The war will be over one day. I shall then consider that my life's final task will be to solve the religious problem. Only then will the life of the German native be guaranteed once and for all. I don't interfere in matters of belief. Therefore I can't allow churchmen to interfere with temporal affairs. The organised lie must be smashed. The State must remain the absolute master.

Christianity is an invention of sick brains: one could imagine nothing more senseless, nor any more indecent way of turning the idea of the Godhead into a mockery.

When all is said, we have no reason to wish that the Italians and Spaniards should free themselves from the drug of Christianity. Let's be the only people who are immunised against the disease.

*14th December 1941, midday
Special Guests: Rosenberg, Boubler, Himmler*

Kerrl, with the noblest of intentions, wanted to attempt a synthesis between National Socialism and Christianity. I don't believe the thing's possible, and I see the obstacle in Christianity itself.

I think I could have come to an understanding with the Popes of the Renaissance. Obviously, their Christianity was a danger on the practical level—and, on the propaganda level, it continued to be a lie. But a Pope, even a criminal one, who protects great artists and spreads beauty around him, is nevertheless more sympathetic to me than the Protestant minister who drinks from the poisoned spring.

Pure Christianity—the Christianity of the catacombs—is concerned with translating the Christian doctrine into facts. It leads quite simply to the annihilation of mankind. It is merely whole-hearted Bolshevism, under a tinsel of metaphysics.

Is Christianity redeemable?

On The Occidental Observer (October 26, 2012) Franklin Ryckaert answered the question: “*Why can’t we have a Christianity that is compatible with some form of race realism?*”:

That would indeed be desirable, especially for Christian America. Unfortunately Christianity has exactly the opposite qualities a “race realist” ideology would require. And what are those?

- 1) Taking the material world as *real*.
- 2) Thinking in terms of *biological groups* (“races”).
- 3) Seeing the human races as different and *unequal*.
- 4) Seeing the world as a *battle field* of competing biological groups.
- 5) Thinking in terms of the survival and flourishing of the *own* biological group.

Christianity has quite the opposite qualities. To wit:

- 1) Unlike the Indian religions Christianity doesn’t consider the material world as an illusion (“Maya”) from which one has to be liberated; it sees the world as created by God but corrupted by man. Still it is wrong to strife for worldly advancement in this “fallen world” as long as it has not been redeemed by the “resurrection,” for which one has to wait.
- 2) Christianity doesn’t think in terms of groups, let alone biological groups; it thinks in terms of individuals whose souls have to be saved.
- 3) Human races may be outwardly different, but inwardly they have the same souls equally capable of salvation.
- 4) The world may seem to be a battlefield, but the task of man is not to win the battle on that battlefield but to bring “peace on earth.”

5) Moral is not what is good for the own group. It is exactly the opposite: what is good for *the other*. Christianity is therefore the most “other directed” ideology in the world.

As you see it would require an impossible juggling trick to change Christianity into a *group evolutionary strategy* for the white man, but that is what Judaism actually is for the Jews, as professor MacDonald has demonstrated so well.

Interim report

Schweitzer's niglets



Albert Schweitzer (1875-1965) was a New Testament scholar and medical missionary in Africa. He received the 1952 Nobel Peace Prize for his philosophy of “Reverence for Life,” expressed in many ways but most famously in founding the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Lambaréné in Gabon, Africa.

We are greatly indebted to Schweitzer and the other Germans that started a secularized research on the New Testament texts since the 18th and 19th centuries. But at the same time we should note that the biography of Schweitzer illustrates what is wrong with those who abandon Christianity only to become out-group altruists.

A Swede who used to comment at the blogsite *Gates of Vienna* said:

Our progressivist paradigm is based on Christian ethics. The Left is all about Christian ethics. What the left-wing is doing is not destroying Western civilization, but completing and fulfilling it: what I call “The Finish of the West.” The current order is the last and terminal phase of Western Christian civilization.

Western Christian civilization is in fact the worst enemy of what I call European civilization: another reason for wanting the Western Christian civilization to go away.

For the very same reason that Christian ethics abhors infanticide, it causes the population explosion in the world.

Christian ethics cannot stand the sight of little brown children dying. They *must* help them, or they will freak out. According to Christian ethics it is forbidden and unthinkable to think in terms of not saving every little brown child across the planet.

But the consequences of this mindset are catastrophic, not only to us but also to them, as I have already explained. But since people are so programmed according to Christian ethics, what I'm saying does not seem to enter their heads. The thought is too unthinkable to be absorbed. It's an utter taboo.

This is derived from the deepest moral grammar of Christianity. The population explosion is not caused by liberalism, it is caused by Christianity in its most general form.

The following is the crux of the Swede's views. It explains why, once you research honestly the New Testament texts to the point of giving up the Christian faith, you will find yourself not a traditional Christian anymore but instead looking for the downtrodden, like Schweitzer with his nignlets, to fulfill a form of secularized Christianity:

With Christ as part of the equation, the Christian ethics of the Gospels became balanced. Humans were seen as imperfect and it was Christ who covered for us with his self-sacrifice. *In Secular Christianity each person has to be like Jesus himself* [emphasis added], doing self-sacrifice, since there's no other way to realize Christian ethics. On top of that, with the Industrial Revolution and the surplus it created in our societies, we came to the point where all the good deeds of Christian ethics could finally be executed by giving off our surplus to all the poor and weak foreign people around the world: food, Western medicine, and other aid.

We should remember that our progressivist paradigm, which is always going left, is based on Christian ethics. *And Christian ethics means the inversion of values* [emphasis added]. So it's the weak that is considered good, while the strong is considered evil.

The keynote of Schweitzer's personal philosophy, which he considered to be his greatest contribution to mankind, was the idea of Reverence for Life (*Ehrfurcht vor dem Leben*). Like millions of secular liberals today, Schweitzer inverted healthy Aryan values when he de facto abandoned Christianity to elaborate an ethical foundation for his new tables. Instead of helping the crown of the evolution in Germany, he preferred the *cloaca gentium* of Africa.

Paraphrasing online encyclopedias, for Schweitzer mankind had to create a new moral structure of civilization that showed respect for life and that led the individual to live in the service of other people—yes, non-whites included. Such was the new set of values

which Schweitzer sought to put into practice in his own life as he departed for Africa in 1913 to work as a medical doctor in the Paris Missionary Society's mission at Lambaréné, in what is now Gabon. The site was nearly 200 miles (14 days by raft) upstream from the mouth of the Ogooué at Port Gentil.

In 1917, exhausted by over four years' work and by tropical anemia, Schweitzer was taken to Bordeaux. By 1920, his health recovering, he was giving organ recitals and doing other fund-raising work to repay borrowings and raise funds for returning to Gabon.

In 1955 Schweitzer was made an honorary member of the Order of Merit by Queen Elizabeth II and other Neo-Christian Britons.⁷ Schweitzer was also a chevalier of the Military and Hospital Order of Saint Lazarus of Jerusalem. He died in 1965 at his beloved hospital in Lambaréné, Gabon. His grave, on the banks of the Ogooué River, is marked by a cross he made himself. This, in spite of the fact that in his most famous book, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, it is clear that he had ceased to believe in the historicity of the gospel stories. But the cross was appropriate: internally, Schweitzer never gave up Christian axiology, only Christian dogma. Like millions of liberals today he was a partial apostate from Christianity; his apostasy was not complete.

What is the moral that those who care for Western preservation should learn from Schweitzer's life and work? Well, who needs Jews when we got Neochristianity? Only complete apostasy from Christianity and its secular offshoot will save whites from extinction. And by "total" I mean what Nietzsche said when criticizing the Neochristian Anglos, which also applies to other secular men:

In England one must rehabilitate oneself after every little emancipation from theology by showing in a veritably awe-inspiring manner what a moral fanatic one is. That is the *penance* they pay there. —We others hold otherwise. When one gives up the Christian faith, one *pulls the right* to Christian morality out from under one's feet.

This view about the dangers of pseudo- or semi-apostasy from Christianity will be expanded in a latter article. But before I would like to say a word illustrating it through one of our classics.

⁷ Remember how the first Puritans and Spaniards that arrived to the New World celebrated the fact that Amerinds started to die of viral infections that whites were already immune. The central point in the Swede's analysis of the axiology that is killing us is that in Secular Christianity—what I call Neochristianity—Christian out-group altruism is not abandoned but *reinforced* in the new tables.

The Christian problem - II

Why were you so ungrateful to our gods as to desert them
for the Jews?

—Julian (addressing the Christians)

From the editor's desk

Wuthering Heights

Secular whites are basically religious ideologues, having replaced self-flagellation and lifelong chastity with anti-white activism and out-group altruism: something analogous to what Schweitzer did.

What is happening throughout the West strongly reminds me Mr. Earnshaw's deranged altruism in *Wuthering Heights*. Just replace "Mr. Earnshaw" with "Western elites," and the "White people" with "Hindley"—Mr. Earnshaw's legitimate son—, and you will see how this classic has depicted our current woes in truly prophetic ways.

* * *

How would we have felt if, as children, our father returned home with a boy of an alien ethnic group and forced it into our bedroom as a new "brother"? How would we have felt if, after resenting this betrayal and picking on the unfortunate intruder—as children usually do—, our father sends *us*, not the intruder, to a boarding school?

Forget every film you have seen to date: because that's how the real *Wuthering Heights* novel began.

In his travels Mr. Earnshaw finds a homeless boy. Once more, forget every Hollywood image because the skin of this boy was similar to that of "a little lascar." Mr. Earnshaw decides to adopt him and name him "Heathcliff." Brontë describes Heathcliff as "dark-skinned gypsy in aspect." Naturally, Mr. Earnshaw's legitimate son, Hindley, finds himself robbed of his father's affections and becomes bitterly jealous of the little lascar.

Every single critic of the novel, even the most conservative, seems to have missed the racial aspect of this fascinating drama. I would go so far as to suggest that, once the ethno-state is established, *Wuthering Heights* will be picked as one of our classics to symbolically convey the tragedy of pushing, against the legitimate heir's will, an illegal alien that after

some time hostilely takes over the entire family estate and starts hunting down key Anglo-Saxon characters in a life dedicated to revenge. Such is *Wuthering Heights*' plot (gypsies are so good at that...).

The drama of the novel only ends when—after the deaths of Mr. Earnshaw, Catherine Earnshaw, Isabella Linton, Edgar Linton, Hindley Earnshaw and Linton Heathcliff (the son of the gypsy who dies as a result of the abuse perpetrated by his father)—Heathcliff finally dies and the second Catherine can, at last, reclaim a life together with her first cousin.

Only pure whites survive at the end of the drama.

Mr. Earnshaw, whose altruistic fondness for the gypsy boy would cause havoc, reminds me what today's whites are doing not with a single family, but with their entire nations: a deranged Christian sense of compassion *à la* St Francis transmuted into secular, runaway liberalism. The drama of *Wuthering Heights* was located in the Yorkshire manor. But presently this is happening by means of non-white immigration into every white heartland.

Reread Brontë to understand whites!

The historical demise of Christianity

*Excerpted from an August 2007 blog entry by Conservative Swede
and a July 2009 exchange on the forum Gates of Vienna:*

We are witnessing the historical demise of Christianity. When a star dies, in its last phase it expands into a red giant, before it shrinks into a white dwarf. Liberalism is the red giant of Christianity. And just as a red giant is devoid of its core, it expands thousandfold while losing its substance and is about to die. The world I live in consists of Christians and liberals. It's their world and I do not belong to them. I leave their limited wars, knee-jerk Islam apologetics and World War II mythology to them. They are not about to change. On the contrary, they are continuously generating new problems with their way of acting.

There were certain sites, certain bloggers, even certain countries, that I had put hope in. But now it has become clear that they are all part of the same big train of lemmings. Bye bye! Denmark, nope. *Brussels Journal*, nope. *View from the Right*, nope. *Gates of Vienna*, nope. This is the way it goes in the world of liberals and Christians. It's their world. I can do nothing but sit on the side and laugh at it. They are too stuck in their inner fears and hang-ups to be able to do anything useful. They will do what they are programmed to do: demise. These people are just not prepared for a proper fight. They are too much driven by superstitious fear and emotions. And there is not exactly anyone else around.

So what's the future for people like me? Because even if I belong nowhere politically, I belong somewhere socially and ethnically. Well, the world is being homogenized. Tomorrow the whole world will be like the Third World. People like me, of European ethnicity, will have no home, no nation. We will live like the Jews as elites in other people's nations (preferably a non-Muslim nation).

* * *

I have written: "People today live in a historyless, now-bubble-world, and have forgotten about all previous such complete [axiological] reversals, many of which happened in the last century," therefore the widespread and deep sense of hopelessness, I forgot to add.

It's hard to conceptualize a situation outside of the bubble, or the bubble not being there, when living inside of the bubble. However, history provides us with numerous examples of such reversals, of bubbles bursting, and of course new bubbles being built (we are bubble mammals after all). This is my happy message, my gospel. People just need to let go their precious beliefs and myths, these huggy teddy bears. When deeply invested in the core beliefs of the bubble, it becomes impossible to look outside of the bubble, to think of a world without the bubble, and everything looks utterly hopeless. Well, it's not. On the contrary, the bubble will burst.

Unlike how it is presented, the relation between left and right is not symmetrical. Instead the left is the norm, and the people to the left are the holy people of secular Christianity. The right is just dancing along, effectively not being much more than an alibi for the whole setup, dancing in circles around the left, who is the one setting up the direction of "progression." Occasionally pulling the break, but never setting up a new general course. The direction of the course is built into the paradigm, and never fundamentally questioned by the right.

Another evidence for the asymmetry between left and right is how right-wingers fear and loathe to be associated with any person or organization even slightly to the right of themselves (they feel that this would totally undermine their reputation), while willing to make connections magnitudes further into the left. Such as appearing in left-wing media, which often makes these right-wingers hilarious, since they feel they have gotten a stamp of approval thereby; while they can be paralyzed by fear of the thought of being published in a right-wing magazine just slightly to the right of themselves.

America is seen as right-wing in the current political theater. However, historically America together with France has been the main force in pushing our civilization to the left.

After World War II European patriotism was seen as the root of the evil, which had to be held down. The only permitted patriotisms were American and Israeli. Britain and France got away with some, but after the Suez crisis in 1956 they were effectively out of the picture too. Now offensive military actions were only accepted from America and Israel.

In the 1950s and the 60s America and Israel were celebrated as model countries of progressivism. European conservatism had been rooted out in the cultural revolution imposed by America in Western Europe. But the Europeans learned fast. First they learned to follow the American example and see America as the model country. The Europeans could pick this up fast since the ideas were rooted in the Christian gospels. But soon they learned that America didn't live up to code of moral goodness that they had imposed on the Europeans. And left-wing anti-Americanism was born. And to be precise, even anti-Americanism wasn't born in Europe but also imported from the US. The problem for America was that in their quest to end all "evil" empires, they had effectively

become the big empire themselves, for example by inheriting the role of maintaining the *Pax Britannica*. Then they had to do all the sort of things they had taught the Europeans were wrong. The Europeans soon learned to beat the Americans in their own game, becoming the leading in progressivism and “holier than thou.” And curiously enough, thus America ended up being seen as right-wing. The original right-wing had been rooted out in a collaboration between America and the European socialists in the wake of World War II. The turning point came by the end of the 1960s—the Vietnam war and the Six-Days war. The image of America and Israel shifted, and they were no longer seen as the model countries of progressivism but as “evil” right-wing countries.

We should remember that our progressivist paradigm (which is always going left) is based on Christian ethics. And Christian ethics means the inversion of values. So it’s the weak that is considered good, while the strong is considered evil. In World War I and World War II America had defeated all the strong (and therefore evil) European empires. The job was completed in the Suez crisis in 1956 by turning against their former allies. But you can never win with Christian ethics, because now America became the strong one, and therefore the evil one. So now American and Israeli patriotism becomes highly questioned and opposed, though not based on restoring any other patriotism but by going even deeper into deranged progressivism. Thus, in effect, American and Israeli patriotism are still the only permitted patriotisms. Surely now the holiest priests of our leftist paradigm condemn the actions of America and Israel. But in effect it is tolerated, while if any other (white) country acts militarily offensively it’s seen as a major global crisis (e.g. Serbia, Russia). So this gives a background to why Geert Wilders, Vlaams Belang, etc., have a pro-American and pro-Israeli profile, and even stress these patriotisms more than their own.

When the threat of Islam is added to the historical situation I gave above, there are westerners who wake up from their deranged progressivism. But they generally revert back to the 1950s (myself I reverted to before World War I). In the face of the Islamic aggression their patriotism gets heightened. But this is a patriotism based on a narrative of hate of Germany and Russia.

So when intensifying this American patriotism in order to build-up the necessary hate against Islam, the hate against Russia and Germany heightens simultaneously. There does not seem to be a way to slide this parameter up without this happening. NATO was after all built on the motto of “Keeping Russia out, Germany down, and America in.” And since this narrative in its previous step is based on the de-legitimization of European patriotism in general, and how hate and demonization of Germans is the blueprint for white guilt and self-hatred, we have a more general problem here too.

* * *

There’s surely no way to stop the chaos coming. But just as surely, from the ashes of the chaos, a fantastic renaissance will grow. We will prevail, severely hurt yes, but with an

ironclad inspired spirit. I just hope the chaos will start soon enough, so that I will be able to live when the turnaround happens.

My conclusion is that we'll have to revert far back in history in order to find something sustainable to build on, to cut off the rotten and infected areas. For some things a hundred years, for some a thousand years. It's definitely not enough to revert the social revolution of the '68.

Gates of Vienna's Ned May said:

Part of the modern Liberal ideal is the foolish notion that we can simply abolish by fiat millions of years of evolution, thousands of years of culture, and centuries of tradition.

Conservative Swede responded:

This is a very important sentence which conveys so very much, if we just examine it closely. Not only the liberals, but also most people (anti-liberals), who see and fear the fall of the liberal world order, have forgotten that these things cannot be erased.

But neither the rise nor the fall of liberalism can take away millions of years of evolution, thousands of years of culture, and centuries of tradition. This is what Chechar refers to as my optimism. It's just following the conservative principle you gave here. But unfortunately the effect of the current belief system is so strong even on anti-liberals, that they cannot see that.

So it's the liberal layer (on top of evolution, culture, and traditions) that will get peeled off, together with those traditions that led to liberalism in the first place.

The fall of this liberal world order will hit us hard (together with the destruction that liberalism has already caused). But we won't suddenly just disappear. And as long as we are around we have millions of years of evolution, thousands of years of culture, and centuries of tradition on our side.

Even if there would be only 100 millions left of us, we are the best people in the history of mankind. As Huntington pointed out, we have always been superior in the ability to apply organized violence. As soon as the will power is there, we can achieve anything we please. We can rule any continent where we choose to live, as long as the liberal layer gets peeled off. And it's bound to come off, since it's just a cosmetic layer. The reason that it has not come off yet is that it has not yet become obvious to the collective mind that it has failed. But that is about to change.

* * *

Norse mythology is a much more useful mythological narrative than Christianity, which does not only mean adherence to universalist individualism and the importation of a foreign god (and in its final stages the importation of a lot of other immigrants), but also has a mythological narrative where the survival of our own people hold no significance whatsoever.

The only people that are guaranteed to survive until the end of days in Christianity are the Jews. Swedes, Italians etc., are of no significance whatsoever. We see all these tenets of Christianity manifested around us today: even in how the struggle for ethnic survival of the Jews is accepted within our current paradigm, while it is not accepted for the other people of our civilization. Each ethnic group needs her great mythological narrative, starting with the birth of her people and guaranteeing their existence until the end of times. Without such a narrative the dissolution of the ethnic group eventually becomes self-fulfilling: there's nothing holding it together.

We see this happening around us in the very now with eager work to dissolve our countries and ethnic groups. In Christianity the Germanic people cannot (as a people) have a relation with god, only the Jewish people has. Germanic (and other) people can only have a relation with god as individuals. People are directed by myths more than anything else, so with a narrative where your ethnic group is of no importance, it will eventually become self-fulfilling (i.e., the opposite effect of self-confidence as a group).

A commenter said:

In that case, I would be very interested to hear what you propose should be done to save western civilisation.

Conservative Swede responded:

And there is your assumption again: that the Western Christian civilization should be saved, that it can be reformed, be mended; while I'm assuming that the current order, the current belief system, will self-implode. And as the current order is the last and terminal phase of Western Christian civilization, which has reached a dead end, this means the end of Western Christian civilization as such. Yes, we are seeing something like the fall of Rome before us.

I've been clear about this from the very beginning. For example, three days ago I wrote: "Likewise many people, who are ideologically invested in the current paradigm instead of in their ethnic group, will see the fall of the Western Christian civilization as the end of the world; commit suicide etc. But instead the fall of the Western Christian civilization should be celebrated. This is the paradigm that stands in the way of our saviour. This is the key knot in need to be untied."

Yes: the Western Christian civilization is exactly the problem, and the problem is solved by it going away.

What we should hold on to are our ethnic groups and European civilization and culture in the deeper sense. Western Christian civilization is a novelty and now it failed. Western Christian civilization is just the tip of that iceberg. It's just a way of politically organizing our peoples. We should not save this format, but save the matter.

The Western Christian civilization is what happened when Germanic people met Christianity. But nothing lasts forever. Quite as the Roman Empire it can be compared with a fruit, going through all the stages: bud, flower, incipient fruit, green fruit, ripe fruit, overripe fruit, rotten fruit. With this I'm saying: (1) indeed Western Christian civilization has meant many good things, and (2) it's all over now.

It is unsustainable for Germanic people to keep Christianity. It would indeed mean their death. And since the Western Christian civilization is all about Germanic people meeting Christianity, the necessary turnaround for Germanic people also means the definitive end of Western Christian civilization. Africans and Italians sticking to Christianity does not make a Western Christian civilization.

When I talk of Christianity I use it in the same sense as Huntington or Qutb. That is, it doesn't matter those who claim to be atheists, they are equally much Christians in this perspective. In fact, you will find that they stick to Christian ethics even stronger than the nominal Christians: trying to be holier than thou, as if trying to get in line before the nominal Christians to the heaven they don't believe in.

Medieval Catholicism was nicely mixed and balanced with Roman and Greek components. The explosive and revolutionary message of the gospels was kept secret from the general public. The Protestant Reformation changed that. Christianity became purified into its Hebrew component, and the explosive and revolutionary message of the gospels were set free. This purification was taken even further, and completed, by the Puritans and the Quakers that left across the Atlantic, to found America. And these are the people who rule our civilization today.

There are several reasons why Christianity leads to secularism in its latter phases. Let me get back to that if there is interest, since this is becoming very long as it is.

Secular Christianity has thrown out god and Christ, but keeps the Christian ethics (inversion of values etc.). And the Christian ethics actually gets heightened and unfettered in Secular Christianity. (I have written much about that in my blog.) With Christ as part of the equation, the Christian ethics of the Gospels became balanced. Humans were seen as imperfect and it was Christ who covered for us with his self-sacrifice. In Secular Christianity each person has to be like Jesus himself, doing self-sacrifice, since there's no

other way to realize Christian ethics. On top of that, with the Industrial Revolution and the surplus it created in our societies, we came to the point where all the good deeds of Christian ethics could finally be executed by giving off our surplus to all the poor and weak foreign people around the world: food, Western medicine, and other aid.

Thus the Western Christian civilization caused the population explosion in the Third World. It is entirely caused by the Western Christian civilization, since these Third World countries were completely unable to do this themselves. Christian ethics commands that every single human life should be saved if possible. Before, more than half of the children in Third World countries died. Now virtually all survive, and we have the population explosion.

What this will lead to is the following:

With the dollar collapse and the complete breakdown of our economical (and then political) world order, mass starvation will spread like a wildfire across the southern hemisphere. This since their population numbers are not supported by themselves, but entirely backed by us. It will all fall apart.

So the concrete effect of Christian ethics here is to make the number of people that will die in starvation and suffering as high as possible once it hits (we are speaking of billions thanks to Christian ethics). Only the devil himself could think out such a brutally cruel scheme, and Christian ethics of course, in which case it's according to the idiom "The road to hell is paved with good intentions."

But that's not enough. This mass starvation, where we can expect something like two thirds of the people dying in the Third World countries, will slash these societies into pieces, and they will meet a complete breakdown.

In the alternative scenario, where the Christian ethics would have kept its fingers away, these countries would have supported themselves: every year many children would have died at a pretty constant pace. But this is a stable phenomenon that does not at all threaten the stability of their societies. When the Western economical order falls apart, they would not be the least affected.

But Christian ethics cannot stand the sight of little brown children dying. They *must* help them, or they will freak out. They cannot keep their fingers away. So they are dooming them to mass starvation in the billions and complete breakdowns of their societies. This is the concrete effect of Christian ethics.

At this point it wouldn't help putting back god and Christ into the equation. Instead we need to leave Christian ethics.

I have already stated how Western Christian civilization = Germanic people + Christianity. I will now clarify why specifically Germanic people need to leave Christianity.

Look at the phenomenon of clan mentality around the world. In many places around the world it is strong, in Europe it is not. But even within Europe there are clear differences. Indeed we find clan mentality in Southern Europe, while there's none of it in Northern Europe (among Germanic people).

There are historical reasons for this. In the cold north people lived far apart. Human contacts were few, and strangers were therefore treated with friendliness. This was the best survival strategy in this context. However, the Mediterranean area was crowded, and there was always competition about land and resources. The best survival strategy in such a context was to stick to your clan, in this tight competition.

The whole point of Christian ethics, when it works well, is to have a balancing effect on the morality of people. In the Mediterranean area it had a balancing effect on the natural clan mentality, leaving a good result. However, Germanic people, as described above, have a natural altruism. When combined with the unfettered Christian ethics of the latter stages of the Western Christian civilization, it creates an interference that goes completely out of bounds. The morality of Germanic people has reached a point where it has to be balanced back, or we will perish. To create this balance Germanic people have to leave Christian ethics. (Romance and Slavic people can keep Christianity. It's not a matter of life or death for them.)

What we are witnessing in the present time is the great tragedy of Germanic people.

With the lack of clan mentality, we find that Germanic people are the ones that most faithfully turn their loyalty towards the nation. But due to the inherent universalism of Christianity, we see in the current incarnation of Western Christian civilization how nations are considered illegitimate and gradually being dissolved. The nationalist loyalty of the Germanic people becomes redirected to universalist loyalty; still lacking of clan mentality.

Germanic people do not use the power of their family to solve problems. They go to a higher level, the authorities. To use the power of your family to solve a problem is here considered a sin, we are supposed to abide to the law. In Italy or Spain people do use the power of their family to solve problems.

There is an abundance of stories in blogs from Northern Europe of kids who go through their whole school time being beaten up by Muslim on a weekly basis. The furthest the parents of these children would do is to bring up the problem with the authorities (and possibly having a "dialog" with the Muslim parents). Which of course will do nothing about it, since the belief system of the authorities doesn't allow for it. And even so the

parents never use the power of their family to deal with the problem. They are programmed to abide to the law and the order.

I cannot see this happening in Italy or Spain. There is a whole different mentality. There would be an outrage, and the whole family would be engaged in the matter. Mostly not going into mafia methods, but in some places yes.

Germanic people are simply wired the wrong way to being able to survive in a multiethnic context. Or to be exact: Germanic people adhering to Christian ethics are. We managed fine in the age of the great migrations and as Vikings.

Now we are entering a world of multiethnic societies at a planetary level. And the Germanic people adhering to Christian ethics are constitutionally unfit for this. Unless we leave Christian ethics, we will perish. Or rather, those who cling to Christian ethics will perish, according to the law of the survival of the fittest.

Leaving Christian ethics has nothing to do with becoming secular (as I explained above). To the contrary, it makes it worse! What is needed is to introduce another great mythological narrative into the minds of the Germanic people. This is the only way to replace the moral grammar of Christianity. Something with roots in our long history. This must be done by political means, by a regime with such a focus. But given that focus, it's not such a big thing to achieve. There are numerous historical examples of how to do it. And it only takes a generation to make the change (even less). And in a dire situation, after a major trauma, it will be even easier.

And thus we are speaking of the deepest level of a paradigm change here. Our very concept of good and bad, our moral grammar, has to be transformed. In sort of perspective, even the apparent moral tautology "We should strive for what is good, and fight against what is bad" no longer holds true.

Our very concepts of good and bad is what has to be transformed. It's hard to think outside of this box. But that's the whole point of the word paradigm. It's a box that it is virtually impossible for people in general to think outside of. I recommend reading Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* for a deeper understanding of the concept paradigm. It's truly a mental box we are trapped within. In the same way we are about to witness the transformation of our whole grammar of morality, quite as our grammar of morality was different before the Age of Christianity.

When the paradigm shifted from Newton to Einstein, it didn't mean the end of science. I just meant the end of a scientific era, which became replaced with a new one. In the same manner the fall of the Western Christian civilization does not mean the end of European civilization in the larger sense. It just means a new era. Quite as when the Roman-Greek civilization was replaced by the Western Christian.

Commenter said:

The latter, being literalists, conceived of themselves as the direct successors to the ancient Israelites who had been given divine authority to kill the Canaanites and establish Israel. The Protestants looked on themselves as the New Israelites and the Native Americans as the New Canaanites to be wiped out.

Conservative Swede responded:

It's sad indeed that Christians have to imagine themselves as Israelites in order to become truly good fighters, which implies effective total war, and the psychology of will power to win at any cost.

Once again it is the same pattern of Christianity that I discussed above, when discussing permitted patriotisms. Our own ethnicity is utterly insignificant in the Christian narrative, while the Jewish ethnicity holds a pivotal position. So Christians have to use this substitute ethnicity to find true confidence and strength.

Good total war has been waged by Christians when imagining themselves as Israelites aiming for building the New Jerusalem. They can also fight limited war in the name of the universal good, or for the sake of Israel (for example the crusades).

But war by Christians in the name of their own ethnicity is considered illegitimate; well, not even of importance. In Christianity we cannot be ourselves. We have to pretend we are someone else.

I still think the Russians can use their Christianity in an efficient way, just since their Christianity hasn't been washed through the Enlightenment, quite as the American pilgrims and the Boers, discussed above, hadn't. Nor Spain of La Reconquista, of course. But we can stay assured that the Christians having been washed through the Enlightenment—and then the Industrial Age, liberalism and secularism—won't be able to see themselves as Israelites. So this strength is not coming back within the context of Christianity.

Why not be ourselves instead? Replace the current mythological narrative with one where we are ourselves. After all, that is the simple truth: We are ourselves. Christianity is based on deception and distortion of reality. Another way to go, for those unable to imagine themselves as the Israelites, is at least to make Christianity universal instead of Jewish. Such as we saw recently here at *Gates of Vienna* in how many people in Poland for example do not see Jesus as Jewish. There's no way to win within the frames of Christianity...

Commenter said:

I agree that Christianity is at the end of its tether and is unable to assert itself without breaking its own value system. Probably something similar must have happened in India during Muslim invasions, where Buddhist ideas of compassion and Karma (you get what you deserve, because you produced the cause) left them completely defenseless. They indeed had no narrative that would support their collective existence.

Conservative Swede responded:

This is an excellent historical comparison. An universalist religion of goodness is replaced with the original national gods, when faced with a threat of existential magnitude.

Commenter said:

Altogether, yours is the most complete argument for the death of Christianity I can imagine, certainly more complete than what Nietzsche has ever written.

Conservative Swede responded:

Thanks, that's a very nice thing to say. Of course, I had an unfair advantage, since I could read Nietzsche but he couldn't read me.

Commenter said:

I am always impressed by the fact that the further North you go in Europe, where people are more Germanic, the more harmonious mastery of mind over nature you can see.

Conservative Swede responded:

Yes, we have focused on fighting nature instead of each other. All due to our historical situation. If we didn't fight nature we died. If we hadn't isolated our house and stored up well for the winter we died. Out of this a special kind of cooperation between people grew. A traditionalist form of egalitarianism, which apart from Sweden and Norway we only find in America (this is an interesting topic in itself, but no time for that now). However, if you put unfettered Christian ethics on top of that...

* * *

A necessary condition for such a Germanic project—and for the renaissance of Europe altogether!—is the return of Germany. Germany today is the planetary bully victim, bound

and caged in many layers of chains and bars. Not permitted to show even a single shred of national self-confidence. We won't see that until American troops have left Germany and the whole NATO regime has been reversed. But it will come. Rest assured.

Above is the first step, and, let's say, how far I think we'll come in this century. We will be in a situation with China as the great power. There will also be competition with Russia. Probably China will be first in occupying the oil fields around the Persian Gulf, but we will be competing with them about it.

America together with France and Britain will be utterly discredited, seen as the guilty ones for the greatest treason in the history of mankind against their own people (as Fjordman put it); while Germany was completely innocent in this, and will hold the morally superior position.

France might no longer exist, having first been overrun by Muslims, and then reconquered by Germanic people.

The United States will no longer exist. But the Confederation of the Northern US States will be a natural ally to the Germanics.

Maybe there will be something as a Germanic empire at this point. Or maybe even two, one German speaking and one English speaking. But I'm not as sure about the English speaking one (I'm not saying people won't speak English, only that there might not be a separate empire with English as the official language).

Will American troops reside in Germany forever? No. When it comes to the imminent fall of the current order, there are too many factors in motion at the same time that each alone has the potential of making it fall: dollar collapse, ethnic civil war, Iranian nukes, weak and paralyzed leadership.

I find Germanic people boring and square, but sort of brilliant (history clearly shows that). After about a decade out in the cold, I have once again taken Germanic people to my heart because I can see their great tragedy. I think I can see their dilemma and how to solve it while at the same time it makes perfect sense for Poles, Spaniards and Celts to take an interest in this for the political stability it would give to all of Europe, once the current order falls. Without it there would be a huge power vacuum.

Who would expand into that? Russia, China, Islam? Or first Islam, then Russia, and finally China? That's the good thing with the day the American troops leave Germany, because at that time the Germanic European will be forced to immediately build a strong military power. And you could imagine how many of the good things that we have discussed here would be catalyzed by that.

When I say that I want Christian ethics to go away, it's not because I want to see a 180 degree turn away from it. Instead it is Christianity that ended up in steep imbalance. What I want to do is to balance things back. So what I have suggested is:

1) A new great mythological narrative where our own ethnic group is given the pivotal position; 2) A constitution where citizenship is reserved for people of our ethnic group. 3) Alien ethnic groups, typically from the Third World, that do not identify with our ethnic group, will have to be removed one way or the other.

* * *

I think it is clear that the people won't turn away from the current belief system with less than a major catastrophe.

But this time the catastrophe is not something as benign as a "Western civil war," but something of a higher magnitude, and of real external threats (which we are not the least prepared for). If we had only been facing something as harmless as World War I or World War II, I wouldn't have been speaking of the end of the Western Christian civilization. If there only had been two strong sides of the West fighting each other to death, we wouldn't have been facing this discontinuity of our civilization.

But now it is our very belief system that makes us unable to fight and defend our civilization. And the threat is external, and when we lose, it means this discontinuity. Losing here means losing our dominant position, not that everything is lost.

Our current empire will fall, that is, America, and not to another Western empire as before—since this time there is no one standing in line—but to external forces.

If we do not meet a major catastrophe within the next twenty years, we will be silently walking into our demographic eclipse, something that could indeed mean the end European civilization and the values that you have talked about. The demographic forces in motion are so great, yes exponential. Not so much our declining birth rates, but the population explosion in the Third World that we are causing and the mass immigration and demographic Jihad in our own lands. If this process continues we will end up in Diaspora as the Jews. And with white people as a mere 2-3% of the world's population and without our own homeland, that's indeed the end of European civilization altogether, and we can say goodbye to the manifestation of all these values that you and I cherish.

It's the Western Christian civilization that feeds all these processes (population explosion etc.). So the Western Christian civilization is in fact the worst enemy of what I call European civilization: another reason for wanting the Western Christian civilization to go away. If it would continue a few decades more it will mean the definitive goodnight for all of us.



Thomas Cole, *Destruction* ~ 1835-1836

So to summarize: When I speak of civilization as in the Western Christian civilization, I speak of a concrete manifestation, an empire. And when I speak of civilization as in European civilization, I speak of the existence and self-government of white people, and the values and life style that is integral in our beings. But now we have come to a point where the former is the greatest threat to the latter.

In Aristotelian terms European civilization is the matter to the Western Christian civilization, which is the form. That is, white people is the matter for the current Western Christian “empire.” But now the form is suffocating the matter.

*Chechar said:*⁸

“It’s the Western Christian civilization that feeds all these processes.” Why do you say this? Wasn’t everything relatively okay up to the 1950s, before the radical feminists almost took away our highest divine right from us: women? If lots of women would still be with us at home having lots of beautiful kids, as the Pope likes, the present problem wouldn’t exist, would it? Doesn’t the sexual revolution is to blame for the demographic winter? And isn’t Islamization of the West a mere by-product of our dwarfing ethnicity? If so why do you blame Western *Christian* civilization? Rome fell precisely because infanticide (the abortion of classical times) and contraception was practiced massively since the times of Julius Caesar. However, since Constantine and Theodosius the Church made enormous efforts to stop infanticide.

I agree that a major catastrophe is needed. That’s why, as I have iterated elsewhere, every morning I wake up with yearning dreams of mushroom clouds above Western cities to

⁸ Editor’s note: I asked this question when I was still very naïve and admired the US.

wake me up—and waking up the West. But couldn't we reject the 1960s revolution without America necessary falling?

Yes: I know you want to delve deeper into the root cause. But I still think that solid arguments based on demographic winter show us that the West took a really wrong turn in the middle '60s. In mean, the West was still healthy the year in which I was born! (maybe because you were born after that you haven't seen the healthy West with your own eyes). We tried to trick the god Eros through contraception and the liberation of women. We are suffering now for having messed with the laws of Nature. Our present problems with a revived Islam are Venus' revenge. Curious, eh, that I am not a Christian—like Tannhäuser I look for the grotto of Venus—yet I admire conservative Protestants and Catholics on this issue?

Conservative Swede responded:

You need to read more carefully, because you missed my point. I repeat what I said:

The demographic forces in motion are so great, yes exponential. Not so much our declining birth rates, *but the population explosion in the Third World that we are causing* and the mass immigration and demographic Jihad in our own lands. It's the Western Christian civilization that feeds all these processes.

Our declining birth rates have a slow effect in comparison with the exponential growth that the population explosion and demographic Jihad means. And it's exactly because of Christian ethics that people, like for example you, entirely look at our own birth rates (narrowly blaming feminism etc.), instead of focusing on the much bigger and alarming problem caused by us: the population explosion in the Third World.

For the very same reason that Christian ethics abhors infanticide, it causes the population explosion in the world. It's a deeply held doctrine within Christian ethics that every single human life across the planet must be saved if possible. According to Christian ethics it is forbidden and unthinkable to think in terms of not saving every little brown child across the planet. But the consequences of this mindset are catastrophic, not only for us but also for them, as I have already explained. But since people are so programmed according to Christian ethics, what I'm saying does not seem to enter their heads. The thought is too unthinkable to be absorbed. It's an utter taboo.

You asked, "Wasn't everything relatively OK up to the 1950s?" Sure it was. But the better our lives got, the more we destroyed, and the faster we destroyed it. It was exactly in the '50s that this problem started. In the '50s people of European descent was 30% of this planet, today we are just a little more than 10%. Not by us decreasing (in fact we are more than in the '50s) but by the rest of the planet exploding in numbers, from 3 to 7 billion people—all caused by us.

The population of Africa is four and a half times higher than in 1950. And the population in Asia almost three times higher.

As I have already explained: With a highly developed industrial society, the Western people got a huge surplus of resources, and much more time at their hands. Since Christian ethics mandates what it does, they have since went around the world to save every single little life that they could: using Western medicine, modern fertilizers, GMO crops, and all other means possible, in order to keep as many alive as possible. Thus the population explosion.

This is derived from the deepest moral grammar of Christianity. But it took all these centuries until we had an industrialized society that made it possible to enact. And because of that Christian ethics mandated that we caused this Third World population explosion. Something that could never have achieved themselves, which makes our deed so deeply irresponsible in so many ways, just because it's artificial. Which means (1) they are not adapting their life-style accordingly but continue and continue to explode in numbers, and (2) they are completely depending on us, which means their societies will totally break apart once our economic world order collapses.

That means that we will have to remove the industrial society, if we want to keep Christian ethics. Think over which one you appreciate the most.

You asked, "But couldn't we reject the '60s revolution without America necessary falling?... the West took a really wrong turn in the middle 1960s." No, this is not a matter of reverting the '60s revolution. It goes far deeper than that. You know, the '60s revolution wasn't brought to us by extraterrestrials. There is an internal logic to our civilization, and its ideals, that led to that. It wasn't an accident. Start looking at the French Revolution.

In general your answer is about rejecting the '60s and going back to older Christian values, rejecting for example abortion and contraception. But this is just a stronger version of the Christian dogma to save every single human life possible. If anything it would just make the Third World population explosion worse! The population explosion is not caused by liberalism: it is caused by Christianity in its most general form. And if you bring in more deeply Christian people, it will only make it worse.

Chechar commented:

When I studied a thick biology text at college, the photo of a Western doctor in the book caught my attention. He was vaccinating dozens upon dozens of black children in Africa!

Instantly I harbored the thought to drop out. How on Earth would a sane person do that, I told myself silently? That deranged altruism was, to my heart, like an industrial factory that produced hundreds of thousands of poor people, like a clone army: future adults who'd have a miserable life anyway. "How am I studying a hard science when the values of mankind are so, er, psychotic," continued my soliloquy. Of course, it's impossible that the liberal mentality understands the mind of a post-Christian individual.

Conservative Swede said:

First the dollar bubble will burst, and soon after, the population explosion bubble. At this point people will see that Christian ethics caused this whole thing, and it will be utterly discredited.

This narrow-minded dogma of saving every possible life, will instead have caused more death and suffering than if Christian ethics hadn't meddled with the situation in the first place. It's like a plan the devil had thought out. To give birth to billions of people that could then be killed in one single blow in mass starvation.

What this Christian dogma hasn't taken in consideration is that each society needs to be self-dependent. Because sooner or later there comes hard times. And if we have made them utterly dependent on us what they will face then is death since they cannot support themselves.

So what this Christian dogma will have caused is the death of *societies*. So much simultaneous death will kill also the societies. This would never have happened if this Christian dogma hadn't entered the picture in the first place. A constant degree of child deaths, while being self-dependent in the traditional way, would have been the best thing for these societies. And wouldn't have hurt them; and neither have hurt us.

I think that once it has happened, people will see this point clearly, and change their ways.

"Feed the world" beats saving the resources of our planet (i.e. actually saving the planet), according to the moral grammar of our current belief system. Quite as multiculturalism and Islamophilia beats for example feminism (as they say: "Race beats gender"). Our moral grammar is full of such hierarchies, from which the priorities are derived, once the objectives end up in conflict with each other. To save every single possible human life is one of our deepest dogmas, but try to discuss overpopulation with these anti-CO₂ freaks (i.e. 90 percent of the Westerners). Even when believing in their theory about "global warming by human CO₂" it would be clear that this problem would be strongly connected to overpopulation. But to address that as a problem is an utter taboo for these people.

And just a general note: People here at *Gates of Vienna* focus on the immigration problem. But mass immigration is just the local projection of this much larger and more

fundamental problem of which I'm talking of here, that is, the planetary population explosion and our attitudes towards it (which also caused it). It won't help to address the immigration problem without addressing this global problem. That is, it won't help to be a lonely, purely Polish, if surrounded by Arabs, Pakistanis and Africans all along the border.

What is happening across the world is the large scale version of what is happening within our countries. Our relative numbers are diminishing by theirs increasing exponentially, in both cases.

Things will not be able to turn around until the current belief system breaks apart, and makes a 180 degree turn. The main thing we can do today is to thoroughly prepare for that moment. These preparations also help protecting ourselves from violence and hardships in any sort of context. So no matter what future scenario one envisions, I'd say that the breakdown of the current belief system is not that far away.

I'd give it around a decade.

- Interim report -

Young westerners who are starting to question the Enlightenment and the ideals of the French Revolution are realizing that “men are not created equal, not individual men, nor the various groups and categories of men, nor are women equal to men,” and that “these beliefs and others like them are religious beliefs; that society is just as religious as ever it was, with an official state religion of progressivism, but this is a new religion, an evil religion.”

Egalitarianism, equality, universalism, the brotherhood of man, the purported inexistence of races and its corollary, non-discrimination as the central value of today’s West, constitute the new religion for whites. Even for Lawrence Auster, a Jew converted to Christianity, contemporary liberalism is “the most radical and destructive ideology that has ever been.”

Post-Christian axiologists do not propose that liberals went wrong forty or fifty years ago, or even two-hundred years ago; but that westerners went astray millennia ago with the debasement of the Aryan gene pool among the Roman citizenship and the eventual destruction of the hard ethos of the classic world. Ironically, although it can be argued that, with all of its equality slogans the French Revolution was Christianity’s bastard child, unlike Christianity the Enlightenment was dangerously optimistic about human nature and the State. “It was another good news religion, telling us what we wish to hear, but about this world instead of the next.”

The views of the late Auster about the quintessence of liberalism, however anticlimactic compared to the Swede’s *Weltanschauung* in the previous pages, are worth citing.

The Judeo-Christian axiom

by Lawrence Auster ★

To deal with the crisis facing our civilization, we must be both realistic and imaginative. The realism part consists in recognizing how bad our situation is.

The entire Western world is at present under the grip of the modern liberal ideology that targets every normal and familiar aspect of human life, and our entire historical way of being as a society.

The key to this liberal ideology is the belief in tolerance or non-discrimination as the ruling principle of society, the principle to which all other principles must yield. We see this belief at work in every area of modern life.

The principle of non-discrimination must, if followed consistently, destroy every human society and institution. A society that cannot discriminate between itself and other societies will go out of existence, just as an elm tree that cannot discriminate between itself and a linden tree must go out of existence. To be, we must be able to say that we are us, which means that we are different from others. If we are not allowed to distinguish between ourselves and Muslims, if we must open ourselves to everyone and everything in the world that is different from us, and if the more different and threatening the Other is, the more we must open ourselves to it, then we go out of existence.

This liberal principle of destruction is utterly simple and radically extreme. Yet very, very few people, even self-described hard-line conservatives, are aware of this principle and the hold it has over our society. Instead of opposing non-discrimination, they oppose multiculturalism and political correctness. But let's say that we got rid of multiculturalism and political correctness. Would that end Muslim immigration? No. Multiculturalism is not the source of Muslim immigration. The source of it is our belief that we must not discriminate against other people on the basis of their culture, their ethnicity, their nationality, their religion. This is the idea of the 1965 Immigration Act, which was the idea of the 1964 Civil Rights Act applied to all of humanity: all discrimination is wrong, period. No one in today's society, including conservatives, feels comfortable identifying this utterly simple idea, because that would mean opposing it.

To see how powerful the belief in non-discrimination is, consider this: Prior to World War II, would any Western country have considered admitting significant numbers of Muslim immigrants? Of course not; it would have been out of the question. The West had a concrete identity. It saw itself as white and in large part as Christian, and there was still active in the Western mind the knowledge that Islam was our historic adversary, as it has been for a thousand years, and radically alien. But today, the very notion of stopping Muslim immigration is out of the question, it can't even be thought.

What would have been *inconceivable* seventy or eighty years ago is *unquestionable* today. A society that seventy years ago wouldn't have dreamed of admitting large numbers of Muslims, today doesn't dream of reducing, let alone stopping, the immigration of Muslims. Even the most impassioned anti-Islamic Cassandras never question—indeed they never even mention—the immigration of Muslims, or say it should be reduced or stopped.

You don't need to know any more than what I've just said. The rule of non-discrimination, in all its destructive potentialities, is shown in this amazing fact, that the writers and activists who constantly cry that Islam is a mortal danger to our society will not say that we ought to stop or even reduce Muslim immigration. Such is the liberal belief which says that the most morally wrong thing is for people to have a critical view of a foreign group, to want to exclude that group or keep it out.

The dilemma suggests the solution. What is now unthinkable, must become thinkable; what is now unsayable, must become sayable; and ultimately it must replace non-discrimination as the ruling belief in society. I know that this sounds crazy, utterly impossible. But fifty or a hundred years ago it would have seemed crazy, utterly impossible, that today's liberalism with its suicidal ideology would have replaced the traditional attitudes that were then prevalent. If society could change that radically in one direction, toward suicidal liberalism, it can change back again. It's not impossible.

In the same way, modern liberalism says that it is evil to believe that some people are more unlike us than others, because that would also be a violation of the liberal principle that all people are equally like us. The equality principle of modern liberalism says that unassimilable immigrants must be permitted to flood our society, changing its very nature.

This is the ubiquitous yet unacknowledged horror of modern liberalism, that it takes the ordinary, differentiated nature of the world, which all human beings have always recognized, and makes it impossible for people to discuss it, because under liberalism anyone who notes these distinctions and says that they matter has done an evil thing and must be banished from society, or at least be barred from a mainstream career.

This liberalism is the most radical and destructive ideology that has ever been, and yet it is not questioned. Communism and big government liberalism were challenged and fought in the past. But the ideology of non-discrimination, which came about after World War II, has never been resisted—it has never even been identified, even though it is everywhere. What is needed, if the West is to survive, is a pro-Western civilization movement that criticizes, resists, and reverses this totalistic liberal belief system that controls our world.

Excerpted from a 2009 speech, “A Real Islam Policy for a Real America” that would be published in a book edited by Michael H. Hart, *Preserving Western Civilization*.

The Christian problem - III

Yes, I understand that you're an
anti-Semite who worships a Jew.

—Fender

Succedaneous religion

by Revilo Oliver

What has happened to the evangelical atheists without their being aware of it is clear. When they expelled their faith in Christianity, they created within themselves a vacuum that was quickly filled by another faith. And the fervor with which they hold that faith is of religious intensity. They preach the joyful tidings that there is no God with as much ardor and sincerity as ever a Christian preached his gospel. They sacrificed themselves, and some even underwent martyrdom, for their faith. If we wanted to indulge in paradox, we could describe them as the zealots of an anti-religious religion, but it is more accurate to say that their faith in a religion, which was rational in that it expected miracles only from the supernatural power of its invisible deity, was replaced by a superstition that expects miracles from natural causes that have never produced such effects—a superstition that is totally irrational.

Societies for the promotion of atheism as such are relatively innocuous and merely exhibit on a small scale a psychological phenomenon that has catastrophic effects when it occurs on a large scale, much as sand spouts and dust devils are miniature tornadoes. When religious faith is replaced by materialistic superstition on a large scale, the consequences are enormous devastation.

The great wave of anti-Christian evangelism swept over Europe about the middle of the Eighteenth Century, and its natural results were most conspicuous in France, where decades of strenuous social reform imposed by a centralized government under a king whose mediocre mind had been thoroughly addled by “Liberal” notions, naturally triggered the outbreak of insanity and savagery known as the French Revolution. Since the shamans and fetish-men of the new superstition control our schools and universities today, the history of that event is little known to the average American, who is likely to have derived his impressions, at best, from Carlyle’s novel, *The French Revolution*, and, at worst, from the epopts and fakirs of Democracy. Obviously, we cannot here insert an excursus of a thousand pages or so on what happened at France at that time, nor need we. The efforts at social uplift through economic and political reforms during the reign of Louis XVI are well summarized by Alexis de Tocqueville in *The Old Régime and the French Revolution*. The best short account in English of the underlying forces of the disaster is the late Nesta Webster’s *The French Revolution*, supplemented by the two volumes of her

biography of Marie Antoinette and Louis XVI and the pertinent chapters of her *World Revolution*.

* * *

We should not damn Rousseau for his influence. The real gravamen of guilt falls on the educated, skeptical, intellectual society that did not laugh at his fantasies about the innate Virtue of hearts uncorrupted by civilization, the Noble Savage, the Equality of all human beings, who can become unequal only through the wickedness of civilized society, the sinfulness of owning property of any kind, and the rest of the tommyrot that you will find in the thousands of printed pages of Rousseau's whining and ranting. You can read all of it—if you grit your teeth and resolve to go through with it—and you really should, for otherwise you will not believe that books so widely read and rhapsodically admired can be so supremely silly and so excruciatingly tedious.

What Rousseau's fantasies produced is an amazing superstition. It is not exactly an atheism, for a vague god was needed to create perfectly noble savages to be corrupted by civilization, and to inspire perfectly pure hearts, like Rousseau's, that overflow with Virtue and drip tears wherever they go; but for all practical purposes, Rousseau's creed substituted "democracy" for God, and put civilized society in place of the Devil. It replaced faith in the unseen and empirically unverifiable with faith in the visibly and demonstrably false.

No such apology can be made for the mighty minds that were stunned by Rousseau's drivel. They could have tested the proposition about natural Equality by just walking down the street with their eyes open, looking inside the nearest prison, or paying a little attention to the conduct of any one of the score of really noteworthy degenerates of very high rank. They must have met every day military men and others who had observed savages in their native habitat and could comment on the innate nobility of the dear creatures. And some conversation with a few footpads and cutpurses would have elucidated the problem whether or not Society was responsible for their having been born without a conscience, wings, and other desirable appurtenances. In fact, no rational person could have escaped a daily demonstration that Rousseau's babble was utter nonsense—except, perhaps, by confining himself in a windowless and soundproof room. But the *philosophes* were able to attain in their own capacious minds a far more total isolation from reality.

Our hyperactive imaginations usually act in concert with the generous impulses that are peculiar to our race—so peculiar that no other race can understand them except as a kind of fatuity from which they, thank God!, are exempt. Long before we began to indulge in international idiocy on a governmental scale, it was virtually routine for Americans to hear that the Chinese in some province were starving, and within a few weeks numerous individuals, many of them comparatively poor, made private contributions, and food was

bought and shipped to the starving (if the collections were honestly made). Now I do not deprecate that exercise of charity, which is a virtue that we instinctively admire, but we should understand that although the Chinese gladly ate the food and politely said “thank you,” they privately concluded that we must be weak in the head. They would never have done anything of that sort, not even for men of their own race in a neighboring province. The White Devils, they decided, must have maggots in their minds. Sympathetic generosity, however, is a virtue or vice of our race, and we shall have to live with it.

What happened in the Eighteenth Century was that Rousseau’s fantasies so excited imaginations and generous impulses that the reasoning mind lost control.

There is, however, a second factor more important for our purposes here. You will find a clear illustration in our recent history, during the presidency of Woodrow Wilson, who appears to have been a not uncommon combination of mental auto-intoxication with corrupt ambition, and who was appointed President after the resident General Manager, Barney Baruch, and his crew had (as one of them boasted to Colonel Dall) led him around “like a poodle on a string,” taught him to sit up and bark for bonbons, and made sure that he was well trained. As we all know, Baruch eventually decided that it would be good for the Jewish people to prolong the war in Europe, so that more Indo-Europeans would be killed and more of their countries devastated, and that the time had come to repay Germany and Austria for their generosity toward the Jews, who had been given in those countries more of economic, social, and political dominance than in any other European nation. It followed therefore that the thing to do was to stampede an American herd into European territory.

Our concern here is with the herd: what set it in motion? We all know how credulous individuals, many of whom had visited Germany and knew better, were impelled to imagine pictures of the evil War Lord, Kaiser Wilhelm II, and the terrible Huns—pictures that were as vivid and convincing as the vision of the monster Grendel that we see every time we read *Beowulf*. And, of course, there was much rant about supposed violations of a code of chivalry that no one even remembered a few years later. A college professor with some reputation as an historian was hired, doubtless for a small fee, to prove that wars are caused by monarchies, although he somehow forgot to mention the terribly bloody war that had taken place on our soil some fifty years before and which had obviously been caused by the dynastic ambitions of King Lincoln and King Davis. And, naturally, the press was filled with many other ravings. So pretty soon the Americans found themselves engaged in a “war to end wars” and a “war to make the world safe for democracy.” It would probably have been a little more expensive—good propaganda costs money—to make them fight a “war to end selfishness” and a “war to make the world safe for goblins,” but it doubtless could have been done. Green snakes are not much harder to see on the wall than pink elephants.

We must not tarry to discuss either the methods of the conspirators who so easily manipulated the American people or the folly of those who were manipulated. Let us consider our enthusiastic rush on Europe as an historical movement.

If, taking the larger view, you ask yourself what that movement most resembled, you will see the answer at once. It was a crusade—or, to be more exact, an obscene parody of a crusade. It was a mass movement inspired by a fervor of religious intensity.

The Crusades, which mark the high tide of Christianity, were (given our faith) entirely rational undertakings. (Except, of course, the so-called Children's Crusade, which is significant only as evidence that even at that early date some members of our race had a pathological propensity to have hallucinatory imaginations.) It was obviously desirable that Christendom own the territory that was a Holy Land, where its God had appeared on earth and whither many pilgrims journeyed for the welfare of their souls. The Crusades were, furthermore, the first real effort of European unity since the fall of the Roman Empire, and they were also a *realistic* missionary effort. It was impossible to convert Orientals to Christianity, but it was possible to make Orientals submit to Christian rulers. The Crusaders established the Kingdoms of Cyprus and Jerusalem and the Principalities of Edessa, Tripoli, and Antioch—and eventually they found it necessary to capture Constantinople. But they could not take Baghdad and their high emprise ultimately failed for reasons which need not concern us here. The Crusades were, as we have said, the high tide of Christianity.

Wilson's fake crusades against Europe evoked from the American people the energies and spirit that the real Crusades had aroused in Europe, and while we must deplore their delusions, we must admire the unanimity and devotion with which the Americans attacked and fought the Europeans. (Of course, we did not actually fight Great Britain, France, and Russia, our ostensible allies; they were defeated in other ways.) The crusade was irrational, however, because it was prompted, not by religion, but by the debased and debasing superstitions represented by Rousseau.

From about the middle of the Eighteenth Century to the present we have witnessed the spread and propagation throughout the West of a superstition that is as un-Christian as it is irrational, as obviously contrary to the Scriptures and tradition of Christianity as it is a blanket denial of the reality that all men see and experience every day—a superstition by which faith in an unseen God is replaced by hallucinations about the world in which we live. After that grotesque superstition inspired the most civilized and intelligent part of France to commit suicide, and loosed the frenzied orgy of depravity, crime, and murder called the French Revolution, its influence was contracted by a resurgence of both Christian faith and human reason, but recovering its malefic power over the imagination and sentimentality of our people, it grew again and as a succedaneous religion it gradually supplanted Christianity in the consciousness of both unintelligent non-Christians and infidel Christians, paralyzing both reason and faith.

This grotesque caricature of religion is now the dominant cult in the United States: its marabouts yell from almost all the pulpits; its fetish-men brandish their obscene idols before all the children in the schools; its witch-doctors prance triumphantly through all the colleges and universities. And virtually everyone stands in fearful awe of the fanatical practitioners of mumbo-jumbo. Both the God of Christendom and the reasoning mind of our race have been virtually obliterated by the peculiar system of voodoo called “Liberalism.”

It is obvious that this mass delusion is leading, and can lead, to but one end. James Burnham named it correctly in his generally excellent book, *Suicide of the West*.

It can be argued—and argued very plausibly—that a race that could long accept the “Liberal” voodoo-cult as a substitute for both its religion and its powers of observation and reason—a race capable of such mindless orgies as a “war to end wars”—a race that has for decades worked to commit suicide—is a race that has become too imbecile to be biologically viable. It is entirely possible that our unique capacity for science and technology will, after all, be no more effective in the struggle for life than was the vast bulk and musculature of the dinosaurs. It may be that any attempt to reason with a people seemingly in the grip of suicidal mania is itself the greatest folly, and that the vainest of all illusions is the hope that anything can save men who evidently no longer want to live.

If we permit ourselves as Christians any hope this side of Heaven, and if we permit ourselves as atheists any hope at all, we must base that expectation on the hypothesis that the collapse of Christendom, the loss of faith in the religion of the West, was a traumatic shock to our racial psyche that stunned but did not kill. If that is so, then there is hope not only that we may revive from the shock and survive, but also that the unique powers of our unique race may again be exerted to give us a future that will be brilliant, glorious, and triumphant beyond all imagining. If that is so...

The above article has been excerpted from chapter 6 of *Christianity and the Survival of the West*.

Revilo Oliver (1908-1994) taught in the Classics Department at the University of Illinois from 1945 until his retirement in 1977. He was a master of twelve languages and especially noted as a scholar of Latin and Sanskrit. Dr. Oliver was a founder of the John Birch Society but he resigned

from that organization in 1966 after its refusal to deal forthrightly with the issues of Jews and race. In 1970 and 1971, he served on the advisory board of the newly formed National Youth Alliance. During his final years of life, Dr. Oliver was on the board of directors for *The Journal of Historical Review*. Most movement activists, however, will remember Dr. Revilo P. Oliver as a contributor of regular articles in the monthly *Liberty Bell* publication.

Letter from Manu

Dear César,

I am attaching a post I wrote last year which may be of your interest. You can include it on your blog if you find it interesting.

There I mention my concern about so little followers and websites related to our cause, the Aryan cause. We do not have but a few thousand followers, both in Europe and in other Western countries. We lack powerful media resources; we need spreading the message massively and time is short. And let's not talk about the bad press we have everywhere.

Another problem is the lack of unity. We do not have a clear and unified ideology. Our groups have to exclude all the Christians and pro-Jewish (or Hinduists or Buddhists) folks. We should pursue a purely ideological Aryan and spiritual purity.

I recently read a couple of articles on Christianity by Pierce in *Counter-Currents*. In discussing these, Pierce had Christianity and white nationalism as mutually exclusive. I absolutely agree with this. Pierce said:

We need ethics; we need values and standards; we need a world view. And if one wants to call all of these things together a religion, then we need a religion. One might choose instead, however, to call them a philosophy of life. Whatever we call it, it must come from our own race soul; it must be an expression of the innate Aryan nature. And it must be conducive to our mission of racial progress.

But we do not need a new religion; only to be aware of our pre-Christian cultures. We must recover such cultures to educate our children according to the varied heritage that these cultures represent. I think of the *Edda*, of the *Mabinogion*; in Homer and Virgil—not to mention our tragedians, our poets, our philosophers... We must extract that immensely rich heritage and moral maxims.

We also need temples, enclosures for *re-connection* as I call them. An ever living fire in these areas will suffice. We need places where we can gather and remember our stories: readings of texts, commentaries, discussion panels and more. Something collective and social;

religious and cultural centers where our people may have psychological or spiritual support, or get truthful information about our ancestors, or the incidents of our history. We need dividing the year with special celebrations related to happy or tragic milestones of our past: the Christianization and the Islamization of our peoples, for example; with our own calendars of days of “saints” (our heroes and those most representative). We need to retrieve the Greek, Roman, Celt, German and other names...

That is, to do what we could not do: having our own history because our history was usurped by the Christian clergy. We only have had a Christian history. This I take from my post “The sublime Indo-European heritage”:

Christianized or Islamized peoples have been deprived of our history, deprived of the natural evolution of our traditions. Our own future has been usurped. We have had an imposed history, Christian or Muslim. These ideologies have led our literary, architectural, scientific, philosophical, and musical creations. For centuries the themes of Biblical or Koranic characters have filled our literature, our architecture (temples dedicated to foreign gods), our music... In our European Middle Ages, for example, you won't find on the windows, walls, cathedrals, or mosques our historical or legendary characters; our thinkers or the milestones of our history. Those are not, therefore, places of worship for ancient Europeans, but for Christians or Muslims.

For hundreds of years our cultural genius was forced to speak in alien terms for our being. Think of the literature, the music or the architecture we would have had if we had not been dominated by a foreign ideology or culture; if we had remained Persians, Greeks, Germans, Slavs...

In short, we need to create the Aryan community (*ecclesia*), which, for the above circumstances, we never had. The Aryan *ecclesias* need to thrive in our towns and cities. Our “priests” (for lack of a better word) are not experts in theology but in history, anthropology and Indo-European linguistics... They must be skilled in the various Indo-European traditions.

It is obvious that such bonding and religious centers will only be for the Aryans. The rest of the peoples or races are excluded. This won't be a universal ideology, but an ethnic one.

I could comment more, but let us leave it here.

Manu

Personal communication translated from Spanish and published on
The West's Darkest Hour on April 9, 2013 with permission of Rodríguez.

Zeus must replace Yahweh

by Manu Rodríguez

You speak of the West, of the decline of the West, of the end of West. But it is the White West the only in danger of disappearing. The White West, the Aryan Nations: Europe and Magna Europa. Our West: our strength, our efforts, our work. Multiculturalism and immigration are causing the dissolution of our Nations. Our countries are filled with sub-Saharan, Asians and Africans (the most numerous), and of Chinese... In due time we will be a minority in our own lands.

Aryan Nation? We are not yet an Aryan Nation. We cannot constitute a “League” of Aryan Nations. We cannot come to our own defense. We are bound, and unarmed. First we have to free ourselves. For millennia we have been alienated peoples, alienated nations. The Jewish-Christian-Muslim and Semitic tradition dominates us completely. They are, ultimately, Semitic traditions instructing us and conforming us (or rather deforming and destroying us) since we are born—from the cradle to the grave.

We are not ourselves; we cannot speak out as long as we try to speak from that space: the Jewish-Christian-Muslim milieu. Within these traditions we are not ourselves, we disappear.

Christianity was for us a Horse of Troy, a poisoned gift, for us. It was the weapon used by the Jews to softly introduce their world into our minds and hearts and to assert their cause (they’re the “chosen” people); to undermine our confidence in ourselves and sow the doubt and bad conscience about our traditions; to dissolve our cultural identity, divide us, weaken us, deconstruct us. This was the strategy of Saul, the Apostle of the “gentiles.” Yes, it had its risks and disadvantages for themselves, but it was a worth try. They achieved their purposes. Ultimately, the Jewish tradition was imposed on our peoples.

With the New Testament came also the Old Testament, the whole Jewish world—which ended up devouring us. The “good news,” the “gospel” was the “luminous” lure. Christianity is a Judaism for the gentiles: a half-Judaism, a decaffeinated Judaism, a castrated and castrating Judaism; an ideology for slaves, servants, and subordinates.

The anti-Judaism or criticism of the Jews in the gospels, or Saul, is a smokescreen. This is what managed to introduce the new Christian order in our European lands: a new and unique god, the god of the Jews; a new and unique sacred land, Israel, the land of the Jews; a new and unique sacred history, the Jewish scriptures (Jewish writings and Judeo-messianic—Christian—writings); a single sacred language (Hebrew); a single chosen people... And let us not forget that “salvation comes from the Jews” (in the New Testament). Meanwhile, our people, lands, histories, and identities were desacralized, desecrated, and banned (our ancestors, temples, sacred places, various traditions, our books...).

The Christianization of our people ended up destroying our ancestral identities, our genuine signs of identity, our collective ancestral memory. It was a violent process of acculturation and enculturation. There we died—there our peoples were killed, or transformed into something else. There our alienation began, our alienated life, our alienated history.

After the several Christianizations our people ceased to exist. No more Greeks, Romans, Goths, Gauls, or Slavs: for these peoples no identity was left other than being Christians or not. The various not yet Christianized peoples of Europe were made to “disappear,” they were agglutinated and blurred out under the term *pagan*, which means rural or rustic. The term referred to Roman peasant cults, but also had connotations for the uneducated, the not cultivated or civilized. It was (and is) a derogatory term. Like the term *goyim*, also derogatory, applied to us by the Jews (or the *kafir* which would use the Muslims—the other Jewish offspring, the second spawn).

Incidentally, the holy book of the Jews (and Christians) is a real protocol of action regarding the Other, the *goyim*, the peoples, the gentiles: a strategy of domain by the Jews (and Christians) against the Other. It points out, for example, the technique of slandering and the undermining of the towns or cities’ morale, which destruction or conquest is intended; it’s about what they envy, lust after or fear: Egypt, Canaan, Jericho, the Philistines, Sodom, Babylon... Rome! (the whole West today). Furious anathemas they throw on them. See the picture they make about their populations, their customs (their decadence and everything else). It is libel and slander of the other people. The Muslims have in addition to this a supplementary text, the Koran. Both in the Old Testament and in the Koran literal and allegorical directions are prescribed to conquer, destroy, or simply how to treat the *goyim* or the *kafir* and the follow-up steps. They are “arts of war,” strategy manuals for every time and place. Such strategies of control are included in what is properly defined as “group evolutionary strategies” (MacDonald).

We, the Aryan peoples, the White West, lack such patently manifest “group evolutionary strategies” (the Semitic way). We are not, however, lacking of advice and warnings, wise judgments, illuminated books; wisdom. We also have our myths, legends, and wonderful stories, the old pre-Christian story which provides us with the weapons and strategies we

need; our own language, our heroic and epic language. They belong to the time when we had group consciousness, when this feeling of belonging to a people was still alive (early Romans, Germans, Celts...); the story of threats, for example, that affects the group or the entire kingdom. Those are stories in allegorical or figurative language, and could be applied in appropriate circumstances.

The evolutionary strategy of Jews, Christians, and Muslims exists, therefore, in their sacred books. They do not need other “protocols” or roadmaps. Such sacred texts are naturally untouchable. The supremacist (megalomaniac) or cruel side implicit and explicit in these texts is usually explained away (because of their archaic and religious nature, they say). Moreover, these “holy” books are universally praised for their humanity and high morals. In certain circles they are considered no longer fashionable, innocuous, harmless.

There can be no greater confusion regarding this issue—no more self-deception. We cannot blame the enemy for his cunning. If their narratives are accepted (if we play their game) their supremacy and our submission are accepted as well. It’s that simple. And this is true for the Jewish, Christian or Muslim narratives. “I give eternal life if you leave everything you have (or you deny yourself) and follow me.” In this manner they present their claims. And so they depart, well equipped of bait, fishing and capture to see who bites, who falls. So they spend their days and survive. We cannot blame the cheater because we, or our ancestors, have fallen into their traps. In our power lies not to be tricked. It was us, the naive, the well-intentioned, the unwarned, confident and silly whites the only responsible for our clumsiness.

It must be said that in this Fall we lost our light and our freedom. That step was a mistake, a mistake that present and future generations must repair.

We were naive, stupid, indifferent, complicit, coward, venal. Everything happened in that Fall, that death, that oblivion. It is good to keep memory of this painful Fall. The cheater is not a thing of the past, he’s still among us.

Since the last century we have had a new batch of Jewish instigators (Adorno, Marcuse...) and, more recently, Muslim (Said, Rauf, Ramadan—Islam continues, since its inception, the strategy of the Jews and they even have improved it). Their drive is to criticize, censure, and undermine the economic, political, social, or cultural foundations of our contemporary world and at the same time advocate a multiracial and multicultural society in our lands. (With which right do these aliens propose any social model in our lands?) They bring both the disease and the remedy; they both diagnose and prescribe as the old Christians did (with their original sin, which affects all mankind and their restoring baptism) or the modern psychoanalysts (with their unhealthy complexes, more or less

innate and universal, and their corresponding “analytic” cure): the machinations and artful trickery of the enemy. Today as yesterday. These misérables are again among us with impunity and with their venomous narratives staining, sickening our past and our present; conditioning, and endangering our future with their insidious socio-cultural proposals, their malicious social therapies (with renewed hooks).

The brand new testament that these new apostles for our gentility preach (newly reclaimed after the fall of the Ancient Regime) is a new attack adapted to the times, a new threat; a new prison, a new shame and a new exile they have prepared for us.

They are building for us a West (a home) that’s vague, diffuse, fuzzy; of open borders, tolerant, pluralistic; multiracial, multicultural, cosmopolitan. A utopia, they tell us, a paradise. They are building our ruin, our hell; they’re reducing our vital space; destroying us slowly, coldly, and systematically. In our own home, these guests.

It is a collective brainwashing what we suffer under these new narratives of “salvation”: narratives from our governments, media, and educational institutions. They have managed to capture the attention and sympathy from the population (the “good” ones, the well-intentioned Left). There are also the miserable converts (the convinced, the deceived, the confused, the unconscious traitors). Both become part of the ranks of the enemy in war against their own race, their own people, and their own cultural traditions: damaging, doing wrong, hurting their own. These rouges know well where to cast the nets. Now as then.

It is a multiple and highly dangerous attack what we suffer today—demographic and ideological. Those are the last battles of a cold war that will soon become hot and which purpose is none other than ending the ancestral, cultural and racial homogeneity of our states, nations or peoples. Undermine our continent, our ancient and millenarian human geography. Destroy us racially and culturally, turning us into a minority in this land of ours, in the land of our ancestors. It is the perfect revenge, the consummate revenge. Finally dispossessed of our lands and our skies we will have no other skies than the Semitic; we will lose everything.

We are disadvantaged before this offensive. Feet and hands bound; morally disarmed, with borrowed, alien, enemy language. The Christian or pseudo-Christian language that is imposed on us (all men are equal, universal human rights, you must tolerate and suffer, love the enemy...) invalidates us, paralyzes us, mutes us, stops us. With this language we shall never defeat our enemies, those who seek our evil. It is a language forged and still shaped for us by the enemies of our being, the “moral” weapon that they leave us to disarm us absolutely. It is the art of transforming wolves and bears into kids and lambs, the poisoned gifts of the enemy.

We cannot reproach the enemy for his strategy or will to power. He does what he can. I would only say that our strategy and our will to power, our light and our will of future must far exceed that of the enemy. Liberate us, recover us, purge us. Get rid of 'em all! Sweat them like a bad fever! Expel them!, throw them out of us; from our lands, our lives. Purify us. Deliver us from our evil! Heal.

It will not be so much an exit, an exodus, as an expulsion: a purification.

Zeus is the god father of our peoples, Zeus/Dyaus. All Aryan peoples call upon him. Zeus is the god of our genius. It is a diurnal, bright, solar god. We love the clarity, truth, justice, wisdom.

We also love drunkenness, divine intoxication: what brings joy. Zeus/Dyaus is our Soma, our Dionysus, our Balder, our Lugh. We owe him the clarity without shadow, the vigor, and the enthusiasm.

We are a people in motion, never still, never stopped. Always forward, always in progress, advancing, going. Behind we have many stories, many rebirths, many auroras. We are a people that are reborn.

We are also a people with memory, a people that does not forget the past, the former transformations since the Paleolithic to the present day: a people with a memory connected to all of our past lives. *The people with the longer memory are the people with the longest future.*

That memory is received as a holy gift. It is the memory of my people, of all the avatars, of all time. It is the heavens of my people; the spiritual, symbolic heritage of the Aryans. Only my people have the right and the privilege to receive this legacy. No other has the right to our history, our memory, or our heaven.

Europa Aryana. The mother earth of the European Aryans, the metropolis; our sacred land. The land of our ancestors and the spirit, the genius of our ancestors. This we must protect and bequeath for the future.

The present and future generations of Aryans have a serious responsibility. This is the harshest hand we have been dealt, the most needed for the minds of us all. In this trance either everyone is saved or none. We must reconstitute the Tree in its fullness. We cannot let down any of our peoples in the hands of the Semites (Jews, Christians or Muslims). All of us have to leave this night, this death, this abyss where we have been detained for hundreds of years.

My friend: in combat light and freedom meet. I wish you clarity, vigor, and enthusiasm.
May the god who unleashes and liberates be with us all.

Translated from Spanish; originally published in *La Respuesta de Europa* as “El dios que desata y libera” (11 October 2012).

The Christian problem IV

What a certificate of mental poverty it was for Christianity that it destroyed the libraries of the ancient world! Graeco-Roman thought was made to seem like the teachings of the Devil.

—Hitler

The Roman legacy

by Manu Rodríguez

Rome not only opened Europe's doors to our Greek brothers, but also to the Syrians, and the Phoenicians, and Jews, and the Persians, and to the Egyptians...

It was a flood, a deluge of Eastern cults. Finally, nothing could be saved because we were not anchored onto anything solid. Uprooted, we went astray after a process of self-destruction that had even corroded our very roots, our very fundamentals (courtesy of our Cynic and Skeptic philosophers and Stoics). We navigated adrift, without a North; a wind without North. We laid at the mercy of anyone, of any clever devil. And that's what happened to us: a clever devil caught us, and we were held captive in his cave for more than a thousand and five hundred years.

In no way did we need any morality or Eastern cult. The European natives (*indigenae*, born of the interior) had their own gods (*indigetes*, divinities of the interior), i.e., their own laws, norms, morals. We were doing well: they were the treasures of the families, the ancestral legacy. While these values were maintained nothing bad could happen to us.

It was the contempt for such symbolic significances what marked the beginning of our decline and ruin: the neglect of our being. We should have been stronger. Instead, notice our superficiality in detaching ourselves from the highest value; our folly, our decline, our stupidity, our decadence, our weakness. We disappointed our parents who are in heaven. We were perfidious, unfaithful, disloyal, infidels; unfair.

Anyone who abandons his people, his mother country, is an outcast, a bastard. Those who abandon their Fathers and their legacy, these are the true stateless. They have no country, no parents; they're only infidels. But that was precisely our behavior. That's what they did, by force or degree, all of our ancestors: the Romans, Greeks, Germans, Celts, Slavs... All of them disowned the Fathers during the fateful Christianization of Europe. I speak for our ancestors. Upon us falls such guilt, such error, such treachery.

We, the present generations of Europeans, have to repair such perfidy, such disloyalty. We must reclaim the thread with our ancestors, the legacy; give it life again.

Here's what we missed, what we throw overboard, what was lost of our sight. I speak of the genius of Rome, from her being and her becoming, of a living branch of the Indo-European tree that has not perished. Of her success and failure we must all learn. They succeeded in both keeping their identity, which made them strong, and their ethical significances, moral and civic, so familiar.

The symbolic significances I mention below are taken from the *Atlas of World History* by Hermann Kinder and Werner Hilgemann, page 88. They are slogans that provide strength and firmness, and moral courage. They were the weapons that we could have used then, and failed to do; but we can use them now. There is still time. It is time to recover what makes us strong and asserts us. Let's see if those significances remain valid. The following is a summary.

The preservation (*disciplina potestas*) of the domestic or household order is made by the father, by the authority (*sapientia*), the maturity of judgment (*consilium*) and integrity (*probitas*). The circumspection (*diligentia*), the rigor (*severitas*), and self-control (*continentia*, and *temperantia*) define the solemn character (*gravitas*) of their actions, acquired by the industriousness (*industria*) and tenacity (*constantia*). As for the training of citizens this is what it says: Valor (*virtus*), independence of judgment and action (*libertas*), glory, devotion (*pietas*), fidelity or reliability (*fides*) and propriety in public life (*dignitas*) constitute the ideal virtues of a Roman citizen; something that he must put in the service of the community (*res publica*) in order to contribute to a greater power and greatness of his people (*maiestas populi romani*). The common good is the highest law (*salus populi suprema lex*).

I also recommend the reading of the treatise *De officiis* (*On Duties*) of Cicero. Each of these Latin terms has a wider semantic field that expresses the translation (that I copied from the original). The *auctoritas* had a sense of moral standing, as when we say "so and so is an authority in a particular science or branch of knowledge." The *sapientia* is both the wisdom, knowledge as intelligence, sanity. *Pietas* is the devotion we owe to the *manes* or Parents, the elder (*mos maiorum*) and to the *res publica*, the mother country. *Sacrae patria deserere* and *deserere patriam* were Roman expressions that designated desertion of the Fathers and the adoption of a foreign religion. *Gloria* is precisely fame, good reputation, be renown; reaching general and public honors after a *cursus honorum* full of merit, in the service of my people, for the greater glory of my people.

These values can be reclaimed today with dignity and without any demerit.

I remind my fellow citizens this past story because presently Europe (and the *Magna Europa*) runs a similar risk to that loss in the ancient world. This time it will be much worse because it is foreign people and foreign to our being what will dominate us. That

was a purely ideological domination; this will also be a demographic domination. We will be clearly disadvantaged on earth and in heaven.

* * *

The decline was soon shown in Greece (since the Alexandrian period) and Rome (since the Carthaginian wars): corruption, despotism, injustice, immorality, treachery—in all areas of life. Polybius and Cicero warned in Rome, as did Columella and Sallust, Tacitus, Persius and Juvenal. Everyone noticed it and pleaded: “Go back to the sources, Roman: return to the Fathers, purify and recover the aura, the prestige (*auctoritas*), the majesty.” All in vain. The echo of that failure still resonates today.

No, it was not the alien cults, nor the Jews or the Christians... It was us, our indifference and our nihilism, the cause of our destruction. There laid our weakness. We were not up to par. We failed to respond adequately to the Christian apologists, for example. There was no Demosthenes, no Cicero in the first Christian centuries. We watched them destroy our foundations. The philosophical schools provided arguments to the Christian propagandists (criticism of our gods, traditions and customs, our values). We weakened the security and confidence in ourselves, in our science, knowledge and powers. The future lords of Europe had little to add.

Doesn't this story sound familiar to you, European? Behold our times. Haven't we for more than two centuries been destroying ourselves? Which result we get from our current nihilism, our skepticism, our relativism, our political, moral and cultural indifference; our profound boredom? We repeat that history. We make the same mistakes. Again, we will be defeated.

Editor's note

Translated from Spanish; originally published in *La Respuesta de Europa* as “El legado romano” (29 December 2011).

“We failed to respond adequately to the Christian apologists, for example. There was no Demosthenes, no Cicero in the first Christian centuries,” writes my friend Manu. Actually, the imperial Church's hate speech laws of the time managed to silence its critics to the point that only learned men, like Manu Rodríguez himself, have heard the names Celsus and Porphyry. Joseph Hoffmann said about the latter:

Throughout its first three centuries, the growing Christian religion was subjected not only to official persecution but to the attacks of pagan intellectuals, who looked upon the new sect as a band of fanatics bent on worldwide domination, even as they professed to despise the things of this world.

Prominent among these pagan critics was Porphyry of Tyre (ca. 232–ca. 305 C.E.), scholar, philosopher, and student of religions. His book *Against the Christians* (*Kata Christianon*), condemned to be burned by the imperial Church in 448, survives only in fragments preserved by the cleric and teacher Macarius Magnes.

The next article reproduces excerpts from the remains of *Against the Galileans* by Julian the Apostate, Roman Emperor from 361 to 363 C.E. Remains I say, because the Church did not even respect the writings of one of their emperors if he happened to dismiss Christianity.

Julian only reigned twenty months. In 364 his friend Libanius stated that Julian had been assassinated by a Christian.

Julian on Christianity



Now I will only point out that Moses himself and the prophets who came after him and Jesus the Nazarene, yes and Paul also, who surpassed all the magicians and charlatans of every place and every time, assert that [Yahweh] is the god of Israel alone and of Judaea, and that the Jews are his chosen people.

Though in Paul's case this is strange. For according to circumstances he keeps changing his views about god, as the polypus changes its colours to match the rocks, and now he insists that the Jews alone are god's portion, and then again, when he is trying to persuade the Hellenes to take sides with him, he says: "Do not think that he is the god of Jews only, but also of Gentiles: yea of Gentiles also."

Now of the dissimilarity of language Moses has given a wholly fabulous explanation. For he said that the sons of men came together intending to build a city, and a great tower therein, but that god said that he must go down and confound their languages.

And then you demand that we should believe this account, while you yourselves disbelieve Homer's narrative of the Aloadae, namely that they planned to set three mountains one on another, "that so the heavens might be scaled." For my part I say that this tale is almost as fabulous as the other. But if you accept the former, why in the name of the Gods do you discredit Homer's fable?

For I suppose that to men so ignorant as you I must say nothing about the fact that, even if all men throughout the inhabited world ever employ one speech and one language, they will not be able to build a tower that will reach to the heavens, even though they should turn the whole earth into bricks. For such a tower will need countless bricks each one as large as the whole earth, if they are to succeed in reaching to the orbit of the moon.

* * *

Why do we vainly trouble ourselves about and worship one [the god of the Jews] who takes no thought for us? For is it fitting that he who cared nothing for our lives, our characters, our manners, our good government, our political constitution, should still claim to receive honour at our hands?

Certainly not. You see to what an absurdity your doctrine comes. For of all the blessings that we behold in the life of man, those that relate to the soul come first, and those that relate to the body are secondary. If, therefore, he paid no heed to our spiritual blessings, neither took thought for our physical conditions, and moreover, did not send to us teachers or lawgivers as he did for the Hebrews, such as Moses and the prophets who followed him, for what shall we properly feel gratitude to him?

* * *

For you would be worshipping one god instead of many, not a man, or rather many wretched men [the Hebrew people in the Bible]. And though you would be following a law that is harsh and stern and contains much that is savage and barbarous, instead of our mild and humane laws, and would in other respects be inferior to us, yet you would be more holy and purer than now in your forms of worship.

But now it has come to pass that like leeches you have sucked the worst blood from that [Jewish] source and left the purer. Yet Jesus, who won over the least worthy of you, has been known by name for but little more than three hundred years: and during his lifetime he accomplished nothing worth hearing of, unless anyone thinks that to heal crooked and

blind men and to exorcise those who were possessed by evil demons in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethany can be classed as a mighty achievement.

As for purity of life you do not know whether he so much as mentioned it; but you emulate the rages and the bitterness of the Jews, overturning temples and altars, and you slaughtered not only those of us who remained true to the teachings of their fathers, but also men who were as much astray as yourselves, “heretics,” because they did not wail over the corpse [the dead Jesus] in the same fashion as yourselves.

But these are rather your own doings; for nowhere did either Jesus or Paul hand down to you such commands. The reason for this is that they never even hoped that you would one day attain to such power as you have.

Why were you so ungrateful to our Gods as to desert them for the Jews?

* * *

But if this that I assert is the truth, point out to me among the Hebrews a single general like Alexander or Caesar! You have no such man. Further, as regards the constitution of the state and the fashion of the law-courts, the administration of cities and the excellence of the laws, progress in learning and the cultivation of the liberal arts, were not all these things in a miserable and barbarous state among the Hebrews? What kind of healing art has ever appeared among the Hebrews, like that of Hippocrates among the Hellenes, and of certain other schools that came after him?

Consider therefore whether we are not superior to you in every single one of these things, I mean in the arts and in wisdom and intelligence; and this is true, whether you consider the useful arts or the imitative arts whose end is beauty, such as the statuary’s art, painting, or household management, and the art of healing derived from Asclepius.

* * *

And let us begin with the teaching of Moses, who himself also, as they claim, foretold the birth of Jesus that was to be. For the words “A prophet shall the lord your god raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; to him shall ye hearken,” were certainly not said of the son of Mary. And the words “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a leader from his loins,” were most certainly not said of the son of Mary, but of the royal house of David, which, you observe, came to an end with King Zedekiah. And certainly the Scripture can be interpreted in two ways when it says “until there comes what is reserved for him,” but you have wrongly interpreted it “until he comes for whom it is reserved.”

It is very clear that not one of these sayings relates to Jesus; for he is not even from Judah. How could he be when according to you he was not born of Joseph but of the holy spirit?

For though in your genealogies you trace Joseph back to Judah, you could not invent even this plausibly. For Matthew and Luke are refuted by the fact that they disagree concerning his genealogy.

* * *

You are so misguided that you have not even remained faithful to the teachings that were handed down to you by the apostles. And these also have been altered, so as to be worse and more impious, by those who came after. At any rate neither Paul nor Matthew nor Luke nor Mark ventured to call Jesus god. But the worthy John, since he perceived that a great number of people in many of the towns of Greece and Italy had already been infected by this disease, John, I say, was the first to venture to call Jesus god.

However this evil doctrine did originate with John; but who could detest as they deserve all those doctrines that you have invented as a sequel, while you keep adding many corpses newly dead [the martyrs] to the corpse of long ago?

Editor's note

The next article reproduces translated excerpts of the general introduction to Karlheinz Deschner's maximum opus. Deschner died when I was editing this book. His ten-volume *Kriminalgeschichte des Christentums* (Criminal History of Christianity) has yet to be translated to English.

Hadn't Britain declared war to Germany in the last century we would have now thorough German studies on the criminal history of Christianity *and* Judaism not from the pen of liberals like Deschner, but from National Socialists. Still, the point of including excerpts of the introduction is that most white nationalist Christians ignore the history of the Church.

Kriminalgeschichte des Christentums

by Karlheinz Deschner

To begin, I will say what the reader should not expect. As in all of my criticisms of Christianity, here there will be missing many of the things that also belong to history, but not to the criminal history of Christianity that the title indicates. That which, also belongs to history, may be found in millions of works that fill up the libraries, archives, book stores, academies and the lofts of the parish houses. He who wants to read those materials can do so long as he has life, patience and faith.

This religion has thousands, hundreds of thousands of apologists and defenders; it has books in which many boast of “the luminous march of the Church through the ages” (Andersen), and that the Church is “one” and “the living body of Christ” and “holy” because “its essence is holiness; sanctification, its end” (the Benedictine von Rudioff).

It is understood, on all this, that the unfortunate side details (religious wars, persecutions, fighting, famine) happened in the designs of God; often inscrutable, always just, full of wisdom and salvific power.

Given the overwhelming predominance of the silly, misleading and deceitful glorifyings, was it not necessary to show, to be able to read, sometime, the opposite view insofar as it is much better proven? At any event, those who always want to see the bright side are shielded from the ugly side, which is often the truest.

The distinction between the Church and Christianity is relatively recent.

As is known, there is a glaring contradiction between the Christians' lives and the beliefs they profess: a contradiction which has always been tried to be downplayed by pointing to the eternal opposition between the ideal and the real. Nobody dares to condemn Christianity because it has not fulfilled all its ideals, or has fulfilled half of them, or not at all. But such an interpretation “equals to carry too far the notion of the human and even the all too human, so that when century after century and millennium after millennium someone does the opposite of what he preaches then he becomes, per share and effect of all his history, epitome and absolute culmination of world-wide and historical

criminality...” as I said during a conference in 1969 which earned me a visit to the courthouse.

Because that is really the question. Not that they have failed the ideals in part or by degrees, no: it is that those ideals have been literally trampled, without which the perpetrators lay down, for a moment, their claims of self-proclaimed champions of such ideals, nor stop their self-declaration of being the highest moral authorities in the world.

* * *

Western Christianity, in any case, “was essentially created by the Catholic Church”; “the Church, organized from the papal hierocracy down to the smallest detail, was the main institution of the medieval order” (Toynbee).

Part of our question are the wars started or commanded by the Church, the extermination of entire nations: the Vandals, the Goths, and the relentless slaughter of East Slav peoples—all of them, according to the chronicles of the Carolingian and the Ottos, criminals and confused peoples in the darkness of idolatry that was necessary to convert by any means not excepting betrayal, deceit and fury.

Of the fourteen legislated capital crimes by Charlemagne after subduing the Saxons by blood and fire, ten offenses relate exclusively to the religious camp. Under the old Polish criminal law, those guilty of eating meat during the Easter fast were punished by pulling their teeth out.

We will also discuss ecclesiastical punishments for violations of civil rights. The ecclesiastical courts were increasingly hated. There are issues that we will discuss extensively: sacrificial practices (the stolen goods from the Church to be repaid fourfold, and according to Germanic law up to twenty times); ecclesiastical and monastic prisons, especially of the *ergastulum* type (the coffins were also called *ergastula*), where they were thrown both “sinners” as the rebels and madmen, and usually installed in basements without windows or doors, but well equipped with shackles of all kinds, racks, handcuffs and chains. We will document the exile punishment and the application of it to the whole family in case of murder of a cardinal; which extended to the male descendants up to the third generation. Also very fashionable were torture and corporal punishment, especially in the East where it became furiously popular to mutilate limbs, pull out eyes and cut off noses and ears.

It is quite plausible that not all authorities indulged themselves in such excesses, and certainly not everyone would be as insane as the Abbot Transamund, who tore off the eyes of the monks of the Tremiti Convent, or cut their tongues (and, despite this, enjoyed the protection of Pope Gregory VII, who also enjoyed great notoriety).

Without doubt, the churches, particularly the Roman Church, have created significant cultural values, especially buildings, which usually obeyed no altruistic reasons (representing power), and also in the domain of painting, responding to ideological reasons (the eternal illustrations of biblical scenes and legends of saints). But aside from such opted love of culture that contrasts sharply with paleo-Christianity—that with eschatological indifference contemplated the “things of this world,” as they believed in the imminent end of all (a fundamental error in which Jesus himself fell)—, it should be noted that most of the cultural contributions of the Church were made possible by ruthlessly exploiting of the masses, enslaved and impoverished century after century. And against this promotion of culture we find further cultural repression, cultural intoxication and destruction of cultural property.

The magnificent temples of worship of antiquity were destroyed almost everywhere: irreplaceable value buildings burned or demolished, especially in Rome itself, where the ruins of the temples served as quarries. In the tenth century they still engaged in breaking down statues, architraves, burning paintings, and the most beautiful sarcophagi served as bathtubs or feeders for pigs.

But the most tremendous destruction, barely imaginable, was caused in the field of education. Gregory I, the Great, the only doctor Pope of the Church in addition to Leo I, according to tradition burned a large library that existed on the Palatine.

The flourishing book trade of antiquity disappeared; the activity of the monasteries was purely receptive. Three hundred years after the death of Alcuin and Rabanus Maurus, the disciples were still studying with manuals written by them. Even St. Thomas Aquinas, the Church’s official philosopher, writes that “the desire for knowledge is a sin when it does not serve the knowledge of God.”

In universities, the Aristotelian hypertrophy aborted any possibility of independent research. To the dictation of theology were subject philosophy and literature. History, as a science, was completely unknown. The experimentation and inductive research was condemned; experimental sciences were drowned by the Bible and dogma; scientists thrown into the dungeons, or sent to the stake. In 1163, Pope Alexander III (remember in passing that at that time there were four anti-popes) forbade all clerics studying physics. In 1380 a decision of the French parliament forbade the study of chemistry, referring to a decree of Pope John XXII.

And while in the Arab world (obedient to Muhammad’s slogan: “The ink of scholars is more sacred than the blood of martyrs”) the sciences flourished, especially medicine, in the Catholic world the bases of scientific knowledge remained unchanged for more than a millennium, well into the sixteenth century.

The sick were supposed to seek comfort in prayer instead of medical attention. The Church forbade the dissection of corpses, and sometimes even rejected the use of natural medicines for considering it unlawful intervention with the divine. In the Middle Ages not even the abbeys had doctors, not even the largest. In 1564 the Inquisition condemned to death the physician Andreas Vesalius, the founder of modern anatomy, for opening a corpse and for saying that man is not short of a rib that was created for Eve.

Consistent with the guidance of teaching, we find another institution, ecclesiastical censure, very often (at least since the time of St. Paul in Ephesus) dedicated to the burning of the books of pagans, Jews or Saracens, and the destruction (or prohibition) of rival Christian literature, from the books of the Arians and Nestorians until those of Luther. But let us not forget that Protestants sometimes also introduced censorship, even for funeral sermons and also for non-theological works, provided they touched on ecclesiastical matters or religious customs.

This is a selection of the main issues that I refer to in my history of the crimes. And yet, it is only a tiny segment of the overall history.

History!

Like any other historian, I only contemplate a history of the countless possible histories, a particular one, worse or better defined, and even this biased aspect cannot be considered the whole “complex of action”: an absurd idea, given the volume of existing data; theoretically conceivable, but practically impossible and not even desirable.

No. The author who intends to write a criminal history of Christianity is constrained to mention only the negative side of that religion... which weight has exceeded ultimately that of the perceived or real positives. Those who prefer to read about the other aspects ought to read other books: *The Joyful Faith*, *The Gospel as Inspiration*, *Is it True that Catholics are No Better Than the Others?*, *Why I Love My Church?*, *The Mystical Body of Christ*, *Beauties of the Catholic Church*, *Under the Cloak of the Catholic Church*, *God Exists (I Have Known Him)*, *The Way of Joy toward God*, *The Good Death of a Catholic*, *With the Rosary to Heaven*, *SOS from the Purgatory*, *The Heroism of Christian Marriage*.

The pro-Christian literature! More numerous than the sands of the sea: against 10,000 titles just one of the style of this *Criminal History of Christianity*, not to mention the millions of issues if we add the countless religious periodicals.

It turns out that there truly are among the Christians men of good will, as in all religions and in every game, which should not be taken as data in favor of those religions and parties, because if that were allowed how many crooks would testify against such belief!

And good Christians are the most dangerous, because they tend to get confused with Christianity, or to borrow the words of Lichtenberg, “unquestionably there are many righteous Christians, only that it is no less true that *in corpore* their works as such have never have helped much.”

What is the basis of my work?

As with most historical studies, it is based on sources, “tradition,” contemporary historiography; especially texts. But when I expose my subjectivity bluntly, my “point of view” and my “positioning,” I think I show my respect to the reader better than mendacious scribes who want to link their belief in miracles and prophecies; in transubstantiations and resurrections from the dead; in heavens, hells and other wonders with the pretense of objectivity, accuracy and scientific rigor.

Could it not be that, with my confessed bias, I am less biased than them? Could it be that my experience, my training, did not authorize me to form a more independent opinion about Christianity? At the end of the day I left Christianity, despite having been formed in a deeply religious household, as soon as it ceased to seem real.

Let’s face it: we are all “partial,” and he who pretends denying it is lying. It is not our bias what matters, but confessing it, without pretense of impossible “objectivities.”

We are all biased. This is particularly true in the case of historians who are more bent on denying it, because they are the ones who lie the most—and then they throw to one another the dogs of Christianity. How ridiculous, when we read that Catholics accused the Protestants of “bias”; or the Protestants the Catholics, when thousands of theologians of various confessions throw over each other so common reproach. For example, when the Jesuit Bacht wants to see in the Protestant Friedrich Loofs “an excess of zeal against monastic status as such,” for which “his views are too one-sided.” And how would not the Jesuit Bacht opine with partiality when he refers to a reformed; he, who belongs to an order whose members are required to believe that white is black and black white, if mandated by the Church?

Like Bacht, unquestioning obedience is imposed upon all Catholic theologians in the habit through baptism, dogma, the chair, the ecclesiastical license to print and many other obligations and restrictions. And so they live year after year, enjoying a steady income in exchange for advocating a particular view, a particular doctrine, a particular interpretation of history, strongly impregnated with theology... not so much to deceive themselves but to continue cultivating the deception of others. For example, accusing of bias the opponents of their confession and pretending to believe that, notwithstanding, Catholics are safe from such defect; as if it didn’t exist, for two thousand years, another bias sneakier than the Catholic.

Historiography... is no more than the projection into the past of the interests of the present. The conservative historian who compared his job to that of the priest (for heaven's sake!) and issued for himself reports of maximum impartiality and objectivity, claimed that he "erased his subjectivity"!

This unshakable faith for objectivism, called "ocularism" by Count Paul York Wartenburg and lampooned as a proposal for a "eunuch objectivity" by Droysen ("only the unconscious can be objective"), is illusory. Because there is no objective truth in historiography, nor history as it happened. "There can only be interpretations of history, and none is definitive" (Popper).

All historiography is written against the background of our personal vision of the world. It is true that many scholars lack such a worldview and thus are often considered, if not markedly progressive, at least notably impartial, honest and truthful. Those are the champions of "pure science," the representatives of an alleged stance of neutrality or indifference as to value statements. They reject any reference to a particular point of view, any subjectivity, as if they were unscientific sins or blasphemies against the postulate of true objectivity they advocate; against that *sine ira et studio* which they have as sacrosanct and that, as Heinrich von Treitschke ironizes, "nobody respects, let alone the speaker himself."

The fiction of the concealment of the ideological premises of the historical presentation can serve to conceal many things: an ethical relativism and a cowardly escapism fleeing categorical decisions on principles—which still is a decision: irresponsibility on behalf of scientific responsibility! For a science that does not make assessments, with that, whether they like it or not, is an ally of the *status quo*; it supports the dominating and hurts the dominated. Its objectivity is only apparent, and in practice it means nothing but love to one's own tranquility, security and attachment to a career.

But our life does not run value-free, but full of them; and scientists, insofar as they start from life, if they claim they are value-free incur in hypocrisy. I have had in my hands works of historians who were dedicated to the wife, who had died in the bombings, or maybe dedicated to two or three fallen sons on the fronts; and yet, sometimes, these people want to keep their writing as "pure science," as if nothing had happened.

That's their problem. I think otherwise. Even if it existed, and I say it does not, a totally apolitical historical research, oblivious to all kinds of judgments, such an investigation would serve no purpose but to undermine ethics and make way for inhumanity. Moreover, it would not be true "research" because it would not be dedicated to reveal the relationships between things; as much as it would be mere preparatory work, mere accumulation of materials, as noted by Friedrich Meinecke.

Now, to what extent does the reality of history coincides with my statement?

I prefer life on principle to science, especially when it starts to become apparent as a threat to life in the broadest sense. This is often objected that “science” is not to blame, but only some of the scientists (the problem is that there are many, at worst almost all)—quite a similar argument that says that we should not take Christianity to task for the sins of Christendom.

All this does not mean that I am a supporter of pure subjectivism, which does not exist. A limited capacity of conviction would my thesis of the criminal character of Christianity have if, to prove it, I confined myself to only some examples. But, being a multi-volume work, no one will say that these are isolated or inconclusive examples.



Because I write “out of hostility,” the story of those I describe has made me their enemy. *And I would not consider myself refuted by having omitted what was also true, but only when someone proves that something I have written is false.*

There are even those who believe that it is very wrong to criticize, especially when they are criticized, although the latter they would never confess. Quite the contrary, they always claim they have nothing against criticism: that all critiques are welcome but, yes, provided they are positive critiques, constructive; not negative or deleterious. With swollen anger they set those high standards, precisely against the “mania of judging” (Aitmeyer), and display their scandal with “scientific” trims when an author dares to “value”; when “the historian, given his inability as moralist, assumes the role of prosecutor.”

Is it not grotesque that the sworn representatives of an ancient mystery cult, those who believe in trinities, angels, demons, hell, virgin births, celestial assumptions of a real body, conversion of water into wine and wine into blood, want to impress us with their “science”? And could it not be the height of grotesqueness that such people continue to receive the honors of the scientific world itself?

We are invited to take care on behalf of the “zeitgeist” so that we understand and forgive. But precisely Goethe satirized it in his Faust: *What you call spirit of the times, is ultimately the spirit of the masters.*

If we are not worth the testimony of the poet for being notoriously anti-Christian and not less anticlerical, let us go to St. Augustine: “Times are hard, miserable times, people say. Let us live well, and times are good. *Because we ourselves are the times that run; so that how we are, so will our time be.*” In his other sermons, Augustine reiterated this idea that there is no reason to accuse the times or the “zeitgeist,” but the very humans that (as the historians of today) blame everything on the times, those miserable, difficult and murky times. Because “time does not offend anyone. The offended are men, and other men are the ones who inflict the offenses. Oh pain! It offends men who are robbed, oppressed, and by whom? Not lions, snakes or scorpions, but men. And so men live the offenses on pain, but will not themselves do the same, if they can, and as much as they have censored it?” Augustine knew what he meant, as he himself fits perfectly in the last sentence of the quotation (see Chapter 10).

As this, ultimately, cannot be denied by the apologists, they object that sometimes (i.e., every time it was necessary, whatever the historical period under consideration) the agents “were not true Christians.”

But look, when there were true Christians? Were they the bloodthirsty Merovingians, the Franks so fond of plundering expeditions, the despotic women of the Lateran period? Was Christian the great offensive of the Crusades? Was it the burning of witches and heretics? The Thirty Years War? The First World War, the Second or the war of Vietnam? If all those were not Christians, then who was it?

In any case, the spirit of the times was not ever the same at each particular time. While Christians were spreading their gospels, their beliefs and dogmas; while they were transmitting their infection to always larger territories, there were not a few men, such as the first great debunkers of Christianity in the second century, Celsus; and Porphyry in the third, who knew how to raise a comprehensive and overwhelming criticism, which we still feel justified.

As Christianity was guilty of appalling outrages, Buddhism, which never had a Western-style organized church in India or central authority dedicated to homogenize the true faith, gave signs of a much higher tolerance. Non-priest believers contracted no exclusive commitment, nor were forced to recant other religions, or converting anyone by force. Their peaceful virtues can be seen, for example, in the history of Tibet, whose inhabitants, a warrior nation among the most feared of Asia, became one of the most peaceful under the influence of Buddhism.

In every century there was a moral conscience, even among Christians, and not less than among “heretics.” Why should we not apply to Christianity its own scale of biblical standards, or even occasionally patristic standards? Do not they themselves say that “by their fruits ye shall know them”?

For me, history (and what I said is but a drop in an ocean of injustices) cannot be cultivated *sine ira et studio*. It would be contrary to my sense of fairness, my compassion for men. He who has not as enemy many enemies, is the enemy of humanity. And is not anyone who pretends to contemplate history without anger or affection similar to the one who is present to a large fire and sees how victims suffocate and does nothing to save them, limiting himself to take note of everything? The historian who clings to the criteria of “pure” science is necessarily insincere. He wants either to deceive others or deceive himself. I would add: he is a criminal, because there can be no worse crime than indifference.

And if the sentence of St. John Chrysostom retains its validity today, “he who praises the sin is guiltier than he who commits it,” would then praising the crimes of history and glorifying the criminals be even worse than these crimes? Would not human affairs be better, and also the affairs of history, if historians (and schools) illuminated and educated based on ethical criteria, condemning the crimes of the sovereigns rather than the praising? But most historians prefer to spread the feces of the past as if they had to serve as fertilizer for the future havens.

An example of it, to cite only one, is the daily glorification of Charlemagne (or Charles the Great). The worst looting expeditions and genocides of history come to be called expansions, consolidation, extension of the catchment areas, changes in the correlation of forces, restructuring, incorporation domains, Christianization, pacification of neighboring tribes.

When Charlemagne oppresses, exploits, as liquidates what is around, that is “centralism,” “pacification of a great empire.” When there are others who rob and kill, those are “raids and invasions of enemies across the borders” (Saracens, Normans, Slavs, Avars) according to Kampf. When Charlemagne, with bags full of holy relics, sets fire and kills on a large scale, thus becoming the nobly smith of the great Frank empire, the Catholic Fleckenstein speaks of “political integration.” Some specialists use even safer, more peaceful and hypocritical expressions as Camill Wampach, professor of our University of Bonn: “The country invited immigration, and the neighboring region of Franconia gave inhabitants to newly liberated lands.”

The law of the jungle, in a word: the one which has been dominating the history of mankind to date, always where a State intended it (or another refused to submit), and not only in the Christian world, naturally.

Because, of course, we will not say here that Christianity is the sole culprit of all these miseries. Perhaps someday, once Christianity disappears, the world remains equally miserable. We do not know that. What we do know is that, with it, everything will necessarily remain the same. That's why I have tried to highlight its culpability in all cases I have found it essential, trying to cover as many cases as possible but, yes, without exaggeration; without taking things out of proportion, as those could judge who either do not have idea about the history of Christianity, or have lived completely deceived about it.

The original text of the introduction was published in 1986.

From the editor's desk

Colhaze's missing article

After seeing the PDF of the first version of *The Fair Race's Darkest Hour*, Michael Colhaze, a featured writer of *The Occidental Observer*, retracted his previous permission to include his piece "Lords of the Ring" in the present compilation. Colhaze, whose native language is German, explained that he is a dedicated Christian and that he has written criticizing Hitler.

While I complied and removed Colhaze's piece from the present edition, on the positive side of this small affair Colhaze's change of mind has moved me to add this page on white nationalist Christians.

Kevin MacDonald's first book of his trilogy opened the door to my understanding of the "Old Testament," the sacred book of the Jews. The Old Testament message promises a racial ethno-state for a Semitic tribe: a message by Hebrew writers for the Hebrew people. On the other hand, in the New Testament the Jew Saul ("Paul") teaches universalism for gentiles. Even though some neochristian exegetes like Albert Schweitzer distinguish between the historical Jesus and the Christ of dogma, it is not possible to ascertain whether a historical Jesus even existed. Nonetheless, the gospel, even if wholly fictional, presents us Jesus as a Jewish liberal who promises us post-mortem survival. This seems to be the biblical message of both Testaments in a nutshell: "An ethno-state for me but not for thee; your reign is not of this world..."

Pierce said that if our race survives this century it will only be because we have gotten the monkey of Christianity off our backs. In my own words I would say: *Pace* white nationalist Christians, the prize to save the white race from extinction is apostasy from our parents' religion.

Part IV

The Aryan problem: Economics over race

Gold over blood

Basically, the American system simply assumes that people will be self-interested pigs, but through the magical device of checks and balances, no single self-interested pig will gain too much power. While I'm in favor of checks and balances, I think we've seen what a culture of self-interested pigs leads to...

—Trainspotter

Heroic Materialism

by Kenneth Clark

Imagine an immensely speeded up movie of Manhattan Island during the last hundred years. It would look less like a work of man than like some tremendous natural upheaval. It's godless, it's brutal, it's violent—but one can't laugh it off, because in the energy, strength of will and mental grasp that have gone to make New York, materialism has transcended itself. It took almost the same time to reach its present conditions as it did to complete the Gothic cathedrals. At which point a very obvious reflection crosses one's mind: that the cathedrals were built to the glory of God, New York was built to the glory of mammon—money, gain, the new god of the nineteenth century. So many of the same human ingredients have gone into its construction that at a distance it does look rather like a celestial city. At a distance. Come closer and it's not so good. Lots of squalor, and, in the luxury, something parasitical.

One sees why heroic materialism is still linked with an uneasy conscience. The first large iron foundries like the Carron Works or Coalbrookdale, date from about 1780. The only people who saw through industrialism in those early days were the poets. Blake, as everybody knows, thought that mills were the work of Satan. 'Oh Satan, my youngest born... thy work is Eternal death with Mills and Ovens and Cauldrons.'

The [slave] trade was prohibited in 1807, and as Wilberforce lay dying in 1835, slavery itself was abolished. One must regard this as a step forward for the human race, and be proud, I think, that it happened in England. But not too proud. The Victorians were very smug about it, and chose to avert their eyes from something almost equally horrible that was happening to their own countrymen.

In its early stages the Industrial Revolution was also a part of the Romantic movement. And here I may digress to say that painters had for long used iron foundries to heighten the imaginative impact of their work with what we call a romantic effect; and that they had introduced them into pictures as symbolising the mouth of hell. However, the influence of the Industrial Revolution on Romantic painters is a side issue, almost an impertinence, when compared to its influence on human life. I needn't remind you of how cruelly it degraded and exploited a mass of people for sixty or seventy years.

What was destructive was size. After about 1790 to 1800 there appeared the large foundries and mills which dehumanised life. Long before Carlyle and Karl Marx, Wordsworth had described the arrival of a night shift ‘that turns the multitude of dizzy wheels, Men, maidens, youths, Mothers and little children, boys and girls, Perpetual sacrifice.’

The terrible truth is that the rise in population did nearly ruin us. It struck a blow at civilisation such as it hadn’t received since the barbarian invasions. First it produced the horrors of urban poverty. It must have seemed—may still seem—insoluble; yet this doesn’t excuse the callousness with which prosperous people ignored the conditions of life among the poor on which to a large extent their prosperity depended, and this in spite of the many detailed and eloquent descriptions that were available to them. I need mention only two—Engels’ *Conditions of the Working Classes in England*, written in 1844, and the novels written by Dickens between 1840 and 1855. Everybody read Dickens. But his terrible descriptions of poverty had very little practical effect: partly because the problem was too big; partly because politicians were held in the intellectual prison of classical economics.

The images that fit Dickens are by the French illustrator Gustave Doré. He was originally a humorist; but the sight of London sobered him. His drawings were done in the 1870s, after Dickens’s death. But one can see that things hadn’t changed much. Perhaps it took an outsider to see London as it really was.

At the beginning of this series I said that I thought one could tell more about a civilisation from its architecture than from anything else it leaves behind. Painting and literature depend largely on unpredictable individuals. But architecture is to some extent a communal art. However, I must admit that the public buildings on the nineteenth century are often lacking in style and conviction; and I believe that this is because the strongest creative impulse of the time didn’t go into the town halls or country houses, but into what was then thought of as engineering. In fact, all modern New York started with the Brooklyn Bridge.



Brooklyn Bridge. Wire cables under construction. Last cable wire was run October 5, 1878.

In this series I have followed the ups and downs of civilisation historically, trying to discover results as well as causes; well, obviously I can't do that any longer. We have no idea where we are going, and sweeping, confident articles of the future seem to me, intellectually, the most disreputable of all forms of utterance. The scientists who are best qualified to talk have kept their mouths shut.

The incomprehensibility of our new cosmos seems to me, ultimately, to be the reason for the chaos of modern art. I know next to nothing about science, but I've spent my life trying to learn about art, and I am completely baffled by what is taking place today. I sometimes like what I see, but when I read modern critics I realise that my preferences are merely accidental.

Western civilisation has been a series of rebirths. Surely this should give us confidence in ourselves. I said at the beginning that it is lack of confidence, more than anything else, that kills a civilisation. We can destroy ourselves by cynicism and disillusion, just as effectively as by bombs. Fifty years ago W.B. Yeats, who was more like a man of genius than anyone I have ever known, wrote a famous poem:

Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

Editor's note

Excerpted from "Heroic Materialism," the last chapter of the book based on the 1969 television series *Civilisation*.

A text by Francis Parker Yockey captures in a single page the world of "heroic" materialism we are rebelling against.

The enemy of Europe

by Francis Parker's Yockey

For the purpose of demonstrating with the utmost clarity the elements of the two world-outlooks in this period of Western history between the Second and Third World Wars, a paradigm is appended:

Primacy of the Spirit / Materialism
Will-to-Power / Will-to-Riches
Rank as social distinction / Wealth as social distinction
Society as organism / Society as a collection of individuals
Fulfilment of Duty / "Pursuit of happiness"
Absolute will to biological fertility / Race-suicide, birth control
Hierarchy / Equality
Aristocracy / Plutocracy
Sexual polarity / Feminism
Order / Freedom
Cultivation of soldierly virtues / Cult of bourgeois virtues
Eroticism as legitimate source of joy and fertility / Eroticism as vice
Conquest / Pacifism, preparation of the coloured populations for "self-government"
Western Man in the service of a great Mission / Man as a Machine
Art practiced in conformity with the Cultural task / "*L'art pour l'art*"
Politico-military expansion / Financial-military-economic expansion

The Enemy of Europe, published posthumously in 1981.

The next conservatism?

by Michael O'Meara

There are, in my view, only a handful of contemporary “conservative” thinkers in the US worth reading. William Lind is one of them.

Associated with the “cultural conservatism” of the Free Congress Foundation (which “advocates the creation of parallel institutions to counter the dominant left cultural forces”), Lind’s main claim to fame is the leading role he’s played in developing the theory of “Fourth Generation Warfare” (4GW), which is why I read him.

His “weekly” column “On War,” posted at the website “Defense and the National Interest,” offers, relatedly, not just one of the best analysis of America’s imperial misadventure in Afghanistan and Iraq (especially in explaining why America’s Second Generation Warfare is so inapt in its struggle against stateless 4GW guerrillas), it maps out a strategy we secessionists will need to heed, if we are ever to free ourselves from the unholy United States.

It was thus with a good deal of anticipation that I picked up *The Next Conservatism*, his latest book, written in collaboration with the recently deceased Paul Weyrich. The book’s premise is that political conservatism, despite its numerous electoral victories, has failed.

Intellectually inspired by the work of Russell Kirk and William Buckley’s *National Review*, post-war conservatives, Lind and Weyrich argue, succeeded in capturing the Republican Party and, under Reagan, gaining national power. This did much to discredit liberalism and contribute to subsequent conservative victories.

But once having won the Cold War, which beat back the threat of Communism and ensured the triumph of the liberal market, conservatives became complacent, failing to respond, in effect, to their own success. This complacency has since rendered conservatism so intellectually vacuous that under Bush II policies that were clearly anti-conservative—such as the Wilsonian crusade for “democracy,” globalization, massive trade and budget deficits, etc.—were not only labeled “conservative,” they were legitimated as such. But more than eviscerating the meaning of conservatism, Republican

rightists have remained indifferent to the left's real source of power: Its near monopoly of the cultural realm.

Culture, Lind and Weyrich claim, is more powerful than politics, influencing, as it does, nearly every facet of life. Thus, despite numerous conservative successes at the polls, the nation has continued to deteriorate, so that today the real forces animating it are those disordering and perverted ones fostered by the left's ongoing subversion of "Judeo-Christian, Western Civilization."

The Next Conservatism, accordingly, will have "to renew the work Kirk, Buckley and others did so well in the 1950s and '60s," but do so by addressing the challenges specific to the 21st century. Foremost among these is the task of restoring both the republic and the culture. The Next Conservatism, then, will absorb whatever remains pertinent in the old conservatism (traditional marriage, balanced budgets, border controls, lower taxes, etc.), but at the same time it will need to refocus on fighting the culture war and opposing the forces that have destroyed the former republican forms of American governance.

Basic to Lind and Weyrich's vision of the Next Conservatism is their understanding of the left's source of power. Once conservatism discredited liberalism, they claim it was replaced by an even more potent ideology—that of Political Correctness or multiculturalism (as if these weren't also forms of liberalism). In their view this new ideology is a form of "cultural Marxism," as developed by the Frankfurt School, whose goal, allegedly, was the destruction of Western Civilization and the imposition of the "soft totalitarianism" described by Aldous Huxley in his 1932 novel *Brave New World*.

Their argument, in short, essentially rehashes much of the usual stock-in-trade of Cold War conservatives, only culture is now recognized as the key to power and the state is seen as increasingly unrepresentative of the nation.

It would be difficult to convey my disappointment with such a tepid understanding of our situation today. It did, however, convince me that the sort of political gruel it serves up as an alternative to the established right must be at least partially responsible for starving the anti-liberal right, leaving it too weak to combat the actual forces of subversion.

It would take a small book at least the size of Lind and Weyrich's just to mention the historical, political, and theoretical problems with their proposed Next Conservatism. But if I had to express it in just a word, I would compare their argument to the vulgar anti-Semitism often found in white nationalist ranks—the sort that thinks *everything* wrong with white society is attributable solely to the omnipotent Jews. Such reductionist thinking stems usually not just from an ignorance of the real forces shaping American society and history, but from a refusal to own up to our own failings as a people.

What Lind and Weyrich call “cultural Marxism” and blame for much of the current disorder ought, more accurately in my view, to be seen as a form of “cultural liberalism.”

Having spent twenty years studying the history and theory of Marxism, I can say with some confidence that Lind and Weyrich, like most American conservatives (as well as most white nationalists), know hardly a thing about it. I also suspect, given their view of it, that they don’t know much about the “civilization” they hope to defend.

The first point that needs raising here is that the left in general and Marxism in particular (including the Frankfurt School) have almost nothing to do with what today passes for the left—which instead of defending the popular classes from the market’s predatory forces endeavors now to remake them in the image of the postmodern tribes (feminists, gays, nonwhites, etc.) it champions. (In this context I might add that white nationalism, like fascism and national socialism before it, owes as much to the historic working-class left as it does to the anti-liberal right).

Historically, both liberalism and the anti-liberal left (Marxism, anarchism, utopianism, etc) arose as political offshoots of Enlightenment rationalism. As such, rationalism’s critique of Catholicism, aristocracy, and the traditional organization of Indo-European society served as a political/intellectual battering ram to clear away whatever impediments the *ancien régime* had posed to the ascent of the newly emancipated forces of late 18th and early 19th-century capitalism.

Because the anti-liberal or socialist left saw the capitalist market as an irrational force at odds with their program to rationalize the social order in ways favoring greater equity and because these leftists sought an alliance with the working classes ground down by industrial capitalism, the distance between liberalism and socialism, especially Marxism, began to divulge in the second half of the 19th century (though they continued to share the same roots).

Yet however anti-Catholic and subversive, liberals, socialists, and Marxists were not *consciously* subverting “Western Civilization.” In the eyes of these leftists, they themselves were the true representatives of the Renaissance humanism, Reformation individualism, 17th-century science, and 18th-century Enlightenment constituting the fundament of modern European civilization.

Today, of course, we know that the left’s vision of “Western Civilization” has come to threaten not just the existence of Europe’s cultural, but its genetic heritage as well. This, though, is something quite different than arguing that such was its self-ascribed aim.

A second point worth raising, especially for those in our own ranks who share the conservative view, is that liberalism was qualitatively more ruinous of traditional European values and beliefs than Marxian socialism (Communism). When Thomas Molnar, who

played an important role in the US conservative movement of the 1960s and '70s, returned to his native Hungary after the collapse of the Soviet empire, he found, to his astonishment, that traditional culture and education, which had virtually disappeared in the West, were still very much alive in the former Soviet bloc. Relatedly, the Italian conservative Catholic philosopher, Augusto Del Noce, could write shortly after the fall of the Berlin Wall that “Communism died in the East because it had triumphed in the West”—and by “Communism” he didn’t mean simply Soviet-style Marxism but also the leveling, quantitative forces of economic society.

A third and final point I think worth making is that the Frankfurt School was largely irrelevant to the Cultural Revolution of the Sixties, whose devastation Lind and Weyrich also attribute to “cultural Marxism.” At the time, only the work of Herbert Marcuse was known and then only among a few. Indeed, much of the Frankfurt School’s work was translated after the Cultural Revolution. Revealingly, the foremost American proponent of Frankfurt School Marxism, Paul Piccone’s *Telos*, evolved (on the basis of its “critical” Marxism) toward a “federalist,” anti-statist populism akin to Lind’s own brand of conservatism.

What Lind, Weyrich, and most conservatives seem unable (or refuse) to recognize is that the nihilism assaulting our culture—along with the family, the existing institutions, and everything else that once made up our historic way of life—is a product not of a tiny group of exiled German Jews. (Incidentally, our two conservative authors refrain from casting the slightest aspersion on the Frankfurt School *qua* Jews and even treat Jews as part of our cultural/civilizational heritage). Rather, this nihilism grew out of a political-economic system indigenous to the American experience.

In other words, the cultural/psychological conditioning that has turned most of our countrymen into a giant digestive tube⁹ wasn’t the work of a few exiled Jewish misfits intent on destroying Western Civilization. As the most cursory glance of the last century’s developments suggests, it was, instead, a product of Big Business and the consumer capitalism necessary to its new forms of production. All the things that Lind and Weyrich identify with cultural Marxism were, in fact, already at work in the early 1920s, before the Frankfurt School had even come into existence. It was only the Crash of 1929 that temporarily sidetracked the ascent of these cultural forces associated with the new corporate forms of mass production.

From this perspective, it should come as no surprise to learn that once the forces of Anglo-American liberalism, in alliance with Russian Communism, succeeded in destroying Europe—not just culturally, but physically, reducing much of it to a heap of rubble—corporate capitalism, in tandem with the new managerial state, began redesigning American culture and society to accord with its specific social-economic imperatives. In

⁹ See the article in this book, “Mugged by reality.” (Note of the Ed.)

this spirit, what was good for General Motors was deemed good for the United States; military Keynesianism replaced the free market and became a welfare provider for the corporate sector; the country's historic racial hierarchy, the one thing preventing it from succumbing to the market's nihilistic egalitarianism, was overturned; cities, in the name of "urban renewal" (i.e., social engineering) were ethnically cleansed and white communities destroyed; masses of Negroes, many of whom, contrary to Lind's claim, were incapable of sustaining civilized forms of urban life, were not just allowed into, but imposed on, white society; suburbanization and television began to resocialize whites as mindless, deracinated consumers; the state, now an empire, no longer a republic, started assuming traditional communal and familial functions; most cultural and educational institutions were taken over by Jews or market forces hostile to tradition.

The list could go on, but the upshot is that our present predicament is the consequence not of the esoteric ideas of a few unpleasant people with names like Horkheimer, Lowenthal, Benjamin, etc., but of the "progressive" technoeconomic civilization that arose in early 20th-century America.

I hate to disappoint Lind (whose works, especially on 4GW, I'll continue to read), but there will be no "next conservatism." There is, indeed, no longer anything left to conserve—except our imperiled generic heritage. And that will be preserved not by promoting retroculture, the dead forms of the old republic, or "parallel structures"—an exercise in futility if ever there were one. Our people will survive only if white men, in struggle, learn again to stand, like their ancestors, on their own two legs and fight for a land of their own, free from everything associated with the monstrous Leviathan that has become the United States.

Perhaps one day our conservatives, many of whom remain decent and sympathetic people, will discover, once their backs are against the wall, that the only political option left at this point in time is either the ethnostate championed by white nationalists or submission to the Judeo-corporate forces of the Obama Nation.

The Occidental Quarterly online, July 10, 2009.

From the editor's desk

The One Ring

“In ancient Rome, as in modern America, the economic system and its imperatives are treated as absolute and fixed, whereas the people are treated as liquid and fungible.”

—Greg Johnson

“After all, the chief business of the American people is business.”

—President Calvin Coolidge

We have now seen that both Tomislav Sunic and Michael O'Meara believe that the Jewish problem, that most white nationalists consider primary, is actually secondary or even tertiary compared to the Christian problem and the worship of Mammon by the gentiles. In a heated debate at the webzine Counter-Currents between O'Meara and what we might start calling *the monocausalists*, those who believe that whites are blameless and that all of our problems are caused by the Jews, O'Meara said:

Kevin MacDonald, unlike his epigones, knows how to make an argument and support it with substantiating evidence. Nevertheless, his argument proves nothing (except his own intelligence), for with the same methods but in reference to different facts, I could make an equally convincing argument to “prove” that corporate capitalism (or the Cold War state, Catholicism, Protestantism, or a half-dozen other factors) were far more influential in legalizing the formal de-Europeanization of the American people.

I think that Sunic and O'Meara are basically right. In fact, the moral of the historical books by William Pierce and Arthur Kemp, both conscious of the Jewish problem, is that non-whites have always overwhelmed the white minority after some centuries of colonization. These first historians of the white race have proven, to my satisfaction, that ever since the civilizations of the Ancient World whites have been losing because they don't follow the golden rule: total separation from non-whites.

The second commandment, “the necessity of not enslaving non-whites” as Joseph Walsh says at the beginning of this book, has been violated over and over by every white empire

in Western history. Conquerors and wealthy whites have fallen, and still fall, in the temptation of trying to use non-whites as Capital: whether slaves, servants, second-class citizens, or wet-backs.

But non-whites *are not Capital*. They are biological creatures whose gene code can decipher the Aryan to the point of crossbreeding. Inspired in Wagner and Tolkien I have called that as falling prey to the “One Ring” or monetary gain above anything else.

Therefore, from the meta-perspective of Kemp and Pierce that reviews several millennia of history (see the long historical texts reproduced in this book), the culprits of the fair race’s darkest hour may be listed, in order of importance, thus:

- 1) The One Ring
- 2) The Christian Problem
- 3) The Jewish Problem

This meta-perspective rings true to my ears even while in “Seeing the forest” and other essays Pierce’s perspective explains beautifully the role of the Jews in white decline. But the Christian and the Jewish problems are far from being the most influential factor. The primary factor seems to be the “economics over race” policies that whites have been following for centuries and even millennia.

One of the best historical paradigms that illustrates my point is the Iberian side of the conquest of America. The main culprit of the catastrophic mestization that took place in the American continent all the way to the lands of the Incas in South America was the Iberians’ lust for gold and silver. The second culprit was the Catholic Church that allowed the bachelor Spaniards in the continent to marry Amerind women the following decade after the conquest of the Aztec Empire. Those are, in my view, the two main factors that explain how the Iberians massively ruined their gene pool in the continent.

The history of New Spain proves that whites are capable of committing ethno-suicide by themselves, without the help of the subversive tribe, who were persecuted and dispatched when detected in the three-hundred year period that lasted the Colonial times. (Hernán Cortés was the first to burn at the stake a couple of Jews in 1528, even before the Inquisition was formally established in New Spain.) It is true that even with such controls some crypto-Jews might have entered spheres of influence. According to one biographer, Bartolomé de Las Casas was of converso heritage, although others refer to Las Casas family as old Christians who migrated from France.

But the larger point is that even if Las Casas (and presumably other crypto-Jews who escaped detection) was of Jewish ancestry, it would be ridiculous to claim that they caused the massive miscegenation that occurred in North, Central and South America. Here the “gold over blood” policies together with Christian axiology ruined the European

genotype. Extermination or expulsion of non-whites into a corner of the newly-discovered continent was well beyond the Catholic sensibilities of the greedy Spaniards and Portuguese. The blunder of baptizing the Moors in the Iberian Peninsula exactly the same year when America was discovered would be committed, again, at the other side of the Atlantic—but this time in a whole continent and on a massive scale. While I admire the expulsion of the Jews from Spain in that very year of 1492, we may ask: What was the point of such measures if Iberian whites could not protect their own ethnicity in America? Shouldn't a final solution to the Jewish problem automatically mean a solution to further Iberian white decline?

I was born in Mexico and nothing shocked me more than learning that, of the 9.5 million Negroes imported into the American continent in the three centuries between 1550 and 1850, most of them were brought into the Hispanic side of the continent. These Africans merged with the mestizos to the point that there are no longer pure blacks left in Mexico.

Yockey's essay reproduced in the next pages, which tackles "liberalism" in the broadest definition of the term, ought to be food for thought for those nationalists who stick to the monocausal hypothesis.

Liberalism

by Francis Parker Yockey

Liberalism is a most important by-product of Rationalism, and its origins and ideology must be clearly shown.

The “Enlightenment” period of Western history which set in after the Counter-Reformation laid more and more stress on intellect, reason and logic as it developed. By the middle of the 18th century this tendency produced Rationalism. Rationalism regarded all spiritual values as its objects and proceeded to revalue them from the standpoint of “reason.” Inorganic logic is the faculty men have always used for solving problems of mathematics, engineering, transportation, physics and in other non-valuing situations. Its insistence on identity and rejection of contradiction are practicable in material activity. They afford intellectual satisfaction also in matters of purely abstract thought, like mathematics and logic, but if pursued far enough they turn into mere techniques, simple assumptions whose only justification is empirical. The end of Rationalism is Pragmatism, the suicide of Reason.

This adaptation of reason to material problems causes all problems whatever to become mechanical when surveyed in “the light of reason,” without any mystical admixture of thought or tendency whatever. Descartes reasoned the animals into automata, and a generation or so later, man himself was rationalized into an automaton—or equally, an animal. Organisms became problems in chemistry and physics, and superpersonal organisms simply no longer existed, for they are not amenable to reason, not being visible or measurable. Newton provided the universe of stars with a non-spiritual self-regulating force; the next century removed the spirit from man, his history and his affairs.

Reason detests the inexplicable, the mysterious, the half-light. In a practical problem in machinery or ship-building one must feel that all the factors are under his knowledge and control. There must be nothing unpredictable or out of control. Rationalism, which is the feeling that everything is subject to and completely explicable by Reason, consequently rejects everything not visible and calculable. If a thing actually cannot be calculated, Reason merely says that the factors are so numerous and complicated that in a purely practical way they render the calculation unfeasible, but do not make it theoretically

impossible. Thus Reason also has its Will-to-Power: whatever does not submit is pronounced recalcitrant, or is simply denied existence.

When it turned its gaze to History, Rationalism saw the whole tendency as one toward Reason. Man was “emerging” during all those millennia, he was progressing from barbarism and fanaticism to enlightenment, from “superstition” to “science,” from violence to “reason,” from dogma to “criticism,” from darkness to light. No more invisible things, no more spirit, no more soul, no more God, no more Church and State. The two poles of thought are “the individual” and “humanity.” Anything separating them is “irrational.”

This branding of things as irrational is in fact correct. Rationalism must mechanize everything, and whatever cannot be mechanized is of necessity irrational. Thus the entirety of History becomes irrational: its chronicles, its processes, its secret force, Destiny. Rationalism itself, as a by-product of a certain stage in the development of a High Culture, is also irrational. Why Rationalism follows one spiritual phase, why it exercises its brief sway, why it vanishes once more into religion—these questions are historical, thus irrational.

Liberalism is Rationalism in politics. It rejects the State as an organism, and can only see it as the result of a contract between individuals. The purpose of Life has nothing to do with States, for they have no independent existence. Thus the “happiness” of “the individual” becomes the purpose of Life. Bentham made this as coarse as it could be made in collectivizing it into “the greatest happiness of the greatest number.” If herding-animals could talk, they would use this slogan against the wolves. To most humans, who are the mere material of History, and not actors in it, “happiness” means economic well being. Reason is quantitative, not qualitative, and thus makes the average man into “Man.” “Man” is a thing of food, clothing, shelter, social and family life, and leisure. Politics sometimes demands sacrifice of life for invisible things. This is against “happiness,” and must not be. Economics, however, is not against “happiness,” but is almost co-extensive with it. Religion and Church wish to interpret the whole of Life on the basis of invisible things, and so militate against “happiness.” Social ethics, on the other hand, secure economic order, thus promote “happiness.”

Here Liberalism found its two poles of thought: economics and ethics. They correspond to individual and humanity. The ethics of course is purely social, materialistic; if older ethics is retained, its former metaphysical foundation is forgotten, and it is promulgated as a social, and not a religious, imperative. Ethics is necessary to maintain the order necessary as a framework for economic activity. Within that framework, however, “individual” must be “free.” This is the great cry of Liberalism, “freedom.” Man is only himself, and is not tied to anything except by choice. Thus “society” is the “free” association of men and groups. The State, however, is un-freedom, compulsion, violence. The Church is spiritual un-freedom.

All things in the political domain were transvalued by Liberalism. War was transformed into either competition, seen from the economic pole, or ideological difference, seen from ethical pole. Instead of the mystical rhythmical alternation of war and peace, it sees only the perpetual concurrence of competition or ideological contrast, which in no case becomes hostile or bloody. The State becomes society or humanity on the ethical side, a production and trade system on the economic side. The will to accomplish a political aim is transformed into the making of a program of “social ideals” on the ethical side, of calculation on the economic side. Power becomes propaganda, ethically speaking, and regulation, economically speaking.

The purest expression of the doctrine of Liberalism was probably that of Benjamin Constant. In 1814 he set forth his views “progress” of “man.” He looked upon the 18th century Enlightenment with its intellectualistic-humanitarian cast as merely preliminary to the true liberation, that of the 19th century. Economics, industrialism, and technics represented the means of “freedom.” Rationalism was the natural ally of this trend. Feudalism, Reaction, War, Violence, State, Politics, Authority—all were overcome by the new idea, supplanted by Reason, Economics, Freedom, Progress and Parliamentarism. War, being violent and brutal, was unreasonable, and is replaced by Trade, which is intelligent and civilized. War is condemned from every standpoint: economically it is a loss even to the victor. The new war technics—artillery—made personal heroism senseless, and thus the charm and glory of war departed with its economic usefulness. In earlier times, war-peoples had subjugated trading-peoples, but no longer. Now trading-peoples step out as the masters of the earth.

A moment’s reflection shows that Liberalism is entirely negative. It is not a formative force, but always and only a disintegrating force. It wishes to depose the twin authorities of Church and State, substituting for them economic freedom and social ethics. It happens that organic realities do not permit of more than the two alternatives: the organism can be true to itself, or it becomes sick and distorted, a prey for other organisms. Thus the natural polarity of leaders and led cannot be abolished without annihilating the organism. Liberalism was never entirely successful in its fight against the State, despite the fact that it engaged in political activity throughout the 19th century in alliance with every other type of Stated-disintegrating force. Thus there were National-Liberals, Social-Liberals, Free-Conservatives, Liberal-Catholics. They allied themselves with democracy, which is not Liberal, but irresistibly authoritarian in success. They sympathized with Anarchists when the forces of Authority sought to defend themselves against them. In the 20th century, Liberalism joined Bolshevism in Spain, and European and American Liberals sympathized with Russian Bolsheviks.

Liberalism can only be defined negatively. It is a mere critique, not a living idea. Its great word “freedom” is a negative—it means in fact, freedom from authority, i.e., disintegration of the organism. In its last stages it produces social atomism in which not

only the authority of the State is combated, but even the authority of society and the family. Divorce takes equal rank with marriage, children with parents. This constant thinking in negatives caused political activists like Lorenz V. Stein and Ferdinand Lasalle to despair of it as a political vehicle. Its attitudes were always contradictory, it sought always a compromise. It sought always to “balance” democracy against monarchy, managers against hand-workers, State against Society, legislative against judicial. In a crisis, Liberalism as such was not to be found. Liberals found their way on to one or the other side of a revolutionary struggle, depending on the consistency of their Liberalism, and its degree of hostility to authority.

Thus Liberalism in action was just as political as any State ever was. It obeyed organic necessity by its political alliances with non-Liberal groups and ideas. Despite its theory of individualism, which of course would preclude the possibility that one man or group could call upon another man or group for the sacrifice or risk of life, it supported “unfree” ideas like Democracy, Socialism, Bolshevism, Anarchism, all of which demand life-sacrifice.

From its anthropology of the basic goodness of human nature in general, Rationalism produced 18th century Encyclopedism, Freemasonry, Democracy, and Anarchism, as well as Liberalism, each with its offshoots and variations. Each played its part history of the 19th century, and, owing to the critical distortion of the whole Western civilization entailed by the first World Wars, even in the 20th century, where Rationalism is grotesquely out of place, and slowly transformed itself into Irrationalism. The corpse of Liberalism was not even interred by the middle of the 20th century. Consequently it is necessary to diagnose even now the serious illness of the Western Civilization as Liberalism complicated with alien-poisoning.

Because Liberalism views most men as harmonious, or good, it follows that they should be allowed to do as they like. Since there is no higher unit to which all are tied, and whose super-personal life dominates the lives of the individuals, each field of human activity serves only itself—as long as it does not wish to become authoritative, and stays within the framework of “society.” Thus Art becomes “Art for Art’s sake,” *l’art pour l’art*. All areas of thought and action become equally autonomous. Religion becomes mere social discipline, since to be more is to assume authority. Science, philosophy, education, all are equally worlds unto themselves. None are subject to anything higher. Literature and technics are entitled to the same autonomy. The function of the State is merely to protect them by patents and copyrights. But above all—economics and law are independent of organic authority, i.e., of politics.

Twenty-first century readers will find it difficult to believe that once the idea prevailed that each person should be free to do as he pleased in economic matters, even if his personal

activity involved the starvation of hundreds of thousands, the devastation of entire forest and mineral areas, and the stunting of the power of the organism; that it was quite permissible for such an individual to raise himself above the weakened public authority, and to dominate, by private means, the inmost thoughts of whole populations by his control of press, radio and mechanized drama.

They will find it more difficult yet to understand how such a person could go to the law to enforce his destructive will. Thus a usurer could, even in the middle of the 20th century, invoke successfully the assistance of the law in dispossessing any numbers of peasants and farmers. It is hard to imagine how any individual could injure the political organism more than by thus mobilizing the soil into dust, in the phrase of the great Freiherr von Stein.

But—this followed inevitably from the idea of the independence of economics and law from political authority. There is nothing higher, no State; it is only individuals against one another. It is but natural that the economically more astute individuals accumulate most of the mobile wealth into their hands. They do not however, if they are true Liberals, want authority with this wealth, for authority has two aspects: power, and responsibility. Individualism, psychologically speaking, is egoism. “Happiness” = selfishness. Rousseau, the grandfather of Liberalism, was a true individualist, and sent his five children to the foundling hospital.

Law, as a field of human thought and endeavor, has as much independence, and as much dependence as every other field. Within the organic framework, it is free to think and organize its material. But like other forms of thought, it can be enrolled in the service of outside ideas. Thus law, originally the means of codifying and maintaining the inner peace of the organism by keeping order and preventing private disputes from growing, was transmuted by Liberal thought into a means of keeping inner disorder, and allowing economically strong individuals to liquidate the weaker ones. This was called the “rule of law,” the “law-State,” “independence of the judiciary.” The idea of bringing in the law to make a given state of affairs sacrosanct was not original with Liberalism. Back in Hobbes’s day, other groups were trying it, but the incorruptible mind of Hobbes said with the most precise clarity that the rule of law means the rule of those who determine and administer the law, that the rule of a “higher order” is an empty phrase, and is only given content by the concrete rule of given men and groups over a lower order.

This was political thinking, which is directed to the distribution and movement of power. It is also politics to expose the hypocrisy, immorality and cynicism of the usurer who demands the rule of law, which means riches to him and poverty to millions of others, and all in the name of something higher, something with supra-human validity. When Authority resurges once more against the forces of Rationalism and Economics, it proceeds at once to show that the complex of transcendental ideals with which Liberalism equipped itself is as valid as the Legitimism of the era of Absolute Monarchy, and no

more. The Monarchs were the strongest protagonists of Legitimism, the financiers of Liberalism.

But the monarch was tied to the organism with his whole existence, he was responsible organically even where he was not responsible in fact. Thus Louis XVI and Charles I. Countless other monarchs and absolute rulers have had to flee because of their symbolic responsibility. But the financier has only power, no responsibility, not even symbolic, for, as often as not, his name is not generally known. History, Destiny, organic continuity, Fame, all exert their powerful influence on an absolute political ruler, and in addition his position places him entirely outside the sphere of base corruptibility. The financier, however, is private, anonymous, purely economic, irresponsible. In nothing can he be altruistic; his very existence is the apotheosis of egoism. He does not think of History, of Fame, of the furtherance of the life of the organism, of Destiny, and furthermore he is eminently corruptible by base means, as his ruling desire is for money and ever more money.

In his contest against Authority the finance-Liberal evolved a theory that power corrupts men. It is, however, vast anonymous wealth which corrupts, since there are no superpersonal restraints on it, such as bring the true statesman completely into of the service of the political organism, and place him above corruption.

It was precisely in the fields of economics and law that the Liberal doctrine had the most destructive effects on the health of the Western Civilization. It did not matter much that esthetics became independent, for the only art-form in the West which still had a future, Western Music, paid no attention to theories and continued on its grand creative course to its end in Wagner and his epigones. Baudelaire is the great symbol *l'art pour l'art*: sickness as beauty. Baudelaire is thus Liberalism in literature, disease as a principle of Life, crisis as health, morbidity as soul-life, disintegration as purpose. Man as individualist, an atom without connections, the Liberal ideal of personality. It was in fields of action rather than of thought that the injury was the greatest.

Allowing the initiative in economic and technical matters to rest with individuals, subject to little political control, resulted in the creation of a group of individuals whose personal wills were more important than the collective destiny of the organism and the millions of the population. The law which served this state of affairs was completely divorced from morality and honor. To disintegrate the organism from the spiritual side, what morality was recognized was divorced from metaphysics and religion and related only to "society." The criminal law reflected finance-Liberalism by punishing crimes of violence and passion, but not classifying such things as destroying national resources, throwing millions into want, or usury on a national scale.

The independence of the economic sphere was a tenet of faith with Liberalism. This was not subject to discussion. There was even evolved an abstraction named "economic man,"

whose actions could be predicted as though economics were a vacuum. Economic gain was his sole motive, greed alone spurred him on. The technic of success was to concentrate on one's own gain and ignore everything else. This "economic man" was however man in general to the Liberals. He was the unit of their world-picture. "Humanity" was the sum total of these economic grains of sand.

The type of mind which believes in the essential "goodness" of human nature attained to Liberalism. But there is another political anthropology, one which recognizes that man is disharmonious, problematical, dual, dangerous. This is the general wisdom of mankind, and is reflected by the number of guards, fences, safes, locks, jails and policemen. Every catastrophe, fire, earthquake, volcanic eruption, flood, evokes looting. Even a police strike in an American city was the signal for looting of the shops by the respectable and good human beings.

Thus this type of thought starts from *facts*. This is *political thinking* in general, as opposed to mere thinking about politics, rationalizing. Even the wave of Rationalism did not submerge this kind of thinking. Political thinkers differ greatly in creativeness and depth, but they agree that facts are normative. The very word theory has been brought into disrepute by intellectuals and Liberals who use it to describe their pet view of how they would like things to be. Originally theory was explanation of facts. To an intellectual who is adrift in politics, a theory is an aim; to a true politician his theory is a boundary.

A political theory seeks to find from history the limits of the politically possible. These limits cannot be found in the domain of Reason. The Age of Reason was born in bloodshed, and will pass out of vogue in more bloodshed.

With its doctrine against war, politics, and violence, it presided over the greatest wars and revolutions in 5,000 years, and it ushered in the Age of Absolute Politics. With its gospel of the Brotherhood of Man, it carried on the largest-scale starvation, humiliation, torture and extermination in history against populations within the Western Civilization after the first two World Wars. By outlawing political thinking, and turning war into a moral-struggle instead of a power-struggle it flung the chivalry and honor of a millennium into the dust.

The conclusion is compelling that Reason also became political when it entered politics, even though it used its own vocabulary. When Reason stripped territory from a conquered foe after a war, it called it "disannexation." The document consolidating the new position was called a "Treaty," even though it was dictated in the middle of a starvation-blockade. The defeated political enemy had to admit in the "Treaty" that he was "guilty" of the war, that he is morally unfit to have colonies, that his soldiers alone committed "war-crimes."

But no matter how heavy the moral disguise, how consistent the ideological vocabulary, it is only politics, and the Age of Absolute Politics reverts once again to the type of political thinking which starts from facts, recognizes power and the will-to-power of men and higher organisms as facts, and finds any attempt to describe politics in terms of morals as grotesque as it would be to describe chemistry in terms of theology.

There is a whole tradition of political thinking in the Western Culture, of which some of the leading representatives are Macchiavelli, Hobbes, Leibniz, Bossuet, Fichte, de Maistre, Donoso Cortes, Hippolyte Taine, Hegel, Carlyle. While Herbert Spencer was describing history as the “progress” from military-feudal to commercial-industrial organization, Carlyle was showing to England the Prussian spirit of Ethical Socialism, whose inner superiority would exert on the whole Western Civilization in the coming Political Age an equally fundamental transformation as had Capitalism in the Economic Age. This was creative political thinking, but was unfortunately not understood, and the resulting ignorance allowed distorting influences to fling England into two senseless World Wars from which it emerged with almost everything lost.

Hegel posited a three-stage development of mankind from the natural community through the bourgeois community to the State. His State-theory is thoroughly organic, and his definition of the bourgeois is quite appropriate for the 20th century. To him the bourgeois is the man who does not wish to leave the sphere of internal political security, who sets himself up, with his sanctified private property, as an individual against the whole, who finds a substitute for his political nullity in the fruits of peace and possessions and perfect security in his enjoyment of them, who therefore wishes to dispense with courage and remain secure from the possibility of violent death. He described the true Liberal with these words.

The political thinkers mentioned do not enjoy popularity with the great masses of human beings. As long as things are going well, most people do not wish to hear talk of power-struggles, violence, wars, or theories relating to them. Thus in the 18th and 19th centuries was developed the attitude that political thinkers—and Macchiavelli was the prime victim—were wicked men, atavistic, bloodthirsty. The simple statement that wars would always continue was sufficient to put the speaker down as a person who *wanted* wars to continue. To draw attention to the vast, impersonal rhythm of war and peace showed a sick mind with moral deficiency and emotional taint. To describe facts was held to be wishing them and creating them. As late as the 20th century, anyone pointing out the political nullity of the “leagues of nations” was a prophet of despair. Rationalism is anti-historical; political thinking is applied history. In peace it is unpopular to mention war, in war it is unpopular to mention peace. The theory which becomes most quickly popular is one which praises existing things and the tendency they supposedly illustrate as obviously the best order and as preordained by all foregoing history. Thus Hegel was anathema to the intellectuals because of his State-orientation, which made him a “reactionary,” and also because he refused to join the revolutionary crowd.

Since most people wish to hear only soporific talk about politics, and not demanding calls to action, and since in democratic conditions it matters to political technics what most people wish to hear, democratic politicians evolved in the 19th century a whole dialectic of party-politics. The idea was to examine the field of action from a “disinterested” standpoint, moral, or economic, and to find that the opponent was immoral, unscientific, uneconomic—in fact—he was *political*. This was devilishness that must be combated. One’s own standpoint was entirely “non-political.” Politics was a word of reproach in the Economic Age. Curiously however, in certain situations, usually those involving foreign relations, “unpolitical” could also be a term of abuse, meaning the man so described lacked skill in negotiating. The party politician also had to feign unwillingness to accept office. Finally a demonstration of carefully arranged “popular will” broke down his reluctance, and he consented to “serve.” This was described as Macchiavellism, but obviously Macchiavelli was a political thinker, and not a camouflageur. A book by a party-politician does not read like *The Prince*, but praises the entire human race, except certain perverse people, the author’s opponents.

Actually Machiavelli’s book is defensive in tone, justifying politically the conduct of certain statesmen by giving examples drawn from foreign invasions of Italy. During Macchiavelli’s century, Italy was invaded at different times by Frenchmen, Germans, Spaniards and Turks. When the French Revolutionary Armies occupied Prussia, and coupled humanitarian sentiments of the Rights of Man with brutality and large-scale looting, Hegel and Fichte restored Machiavelli once again to respect as a thinker. He represented a means of defense against a foe armed with a humanitarian ideology. Machiavelli showed the actual role played by verbal sentiments in politics.

One can say that there are three possible attitudes toward human conduct, from the point of evaluating its motives: the sentimental, the realistic, and the cynical. The sentimental imputes a good motive to everybody, the cynical a bad motive, and the realistic simply seeks the facts. When a sentimentalist, e.g., a Liberal, enters politics, he becomes perforce a hypocrite. The ultimate exposure of this hypocrisy creates cynicism. Part of the spiritual sickness following the First World War was a wave of cynicism which arose from the transparent, revolting, and incredible hypocrisy of the little men who were presiding over affairs at that time. Macchiavelli had however an incorruptible intellect and did not write in a cynical spirit. He sought to portray the anatomy of politics with its peculiar problems and tensions, inner and outer. To the fantastic mental illness of Rationalism, hard facts are regrettable things, and to talk about them is to create them. A tiny politician of the Liberal type even sought to prevent talk about the Third World War, after the Second. Liberalism is, in one word, *weakness*. It wants every day to be a birthday, Life to be a long party. The inexorable movement of Time, Destiny, History, the cruelty of accomplishment, sternness, heroism, sacrifice, superpersonal ideas—these are the enemy.

Liberalism is an escape from hardness into softness, from masculinity into femininity, from History into herd-grazing, from reality into herbivorous dreams, from Destiny into Happiness. Nietzsche, in his last and greatest work, designated the 18th century as the century of feminism, and immediately mentioned Rousseau, the leader of the mass-escape from Reality. Feminism itself—what is it but a means of feminizing man? If it makes women man-like, it does so only by transforming man first into a creature whose only concern is with his personal economics and his relation to “society,” i.e. a woman. “Society” is the element of woman, it is static and formal, its contests are purely personal, and are free from the possibility of heroism and violence. Conversation, not action; formality, not deeds. How different is the idea of *rank* used in connection with a social affair, from when it is applied on a battlefield! In the field, it is fate-laden; in the salon it is vain and pompous. A war is fought for control; social contests are inspired by feminine vanity and jealousy to show that one is “better” than someone else.

And yet what does Liberalism do ultimately to woman: it puts a uniform on her and calls her a “soldier.” This ridiculous performance but illustrates the eternal fact that History is masculine, that its stern demands cannot be evaded, that the fundamental realities cannot be renounced, even, by the most elaborate make-believe. Liberalistic tampering with sexual polarity only wreaks havoc on the souls of individuals, confusing and distorting them, but the man-woman and the woman-man it creates are both subject to the higher Destiny of History.

Imperium (1962), pages 208-223.

Toward a meta-perspective of the white race

Race is not a social construct; society is a racial construct.

—*Stormfront* commenter

From the editor's desk

Capitalism, Gold, the “One Ring” can physically corrupt Aryans who wear it for extended periods of time, eventually transforming them into mudbloods.

I won't apologize for reproducing within this book an abridged version of *Who We Are: The History of the White Race*, that William L. Pierce published in the tabloid issues of *National Vanguard*. (In addition to the abridgement of chapters 10 to 26, the first nine chapters are omitted altogether.)

The history of the Indo-European peoples is the most basic subject I can think of. Nothing depicts better how the Aryan peoples fall again and again under the spell of the “One Ring” that simply retelling the whole story of their race.

Our long, long history

by William Pierce



*Last Nordic Invasion of Greece
Precedes Rise of Classical Civilization
Dorians Brought Iron, New Blood to Greece
Athenian Democracy Led to Downfall*

Greece was invaded by Greek-speaking Northerners several times during prehistory. Those who arrived in the period 2,100-1,900 B.C. founded the great Mycenaean civilization, which flourished from the end of the 16th century until about 1,200 B.C.

Homer, whose *Iliad* and *Odyssey* describe Mycenaean Greece, refers to the Greeks, or Hellenes, inclusively as "Achaeans." In fact, however, the Achaeans were only one of the Hellenic tribes which were in Greece in Mycenaean times.

In addition to the Achaeans, who occupied most of the Peloponnesus (the southern peninsula of Greece, in which Mycenae was located), there were the Aeolians and the

Ionians, who occupied other portions of the mainland, many of the Aegean islands, and the west coast of Asia Minor. The Ionians, in particular, settled in Attica and were the founders of Athens.

These tribal divisions apparently predate the arrival of the first Hellenes in Greece, and it seems likely that the Achaeans, Aeolians, and Ionians invaded the Aegean region separately, over a period of several centuries.

And there were also the non-Greek Pelasgians, the Mediterranean aborigines, who occupied the lowest stratum of Greek society and substantially outnumbered the Hellenes in Mycenaean times. As pointed out in the last chapter, the Mycenaean Greeks were influenced culturally by these Mediterraneans—and, as time passed, racially as well.

In the late 14th and early 13th centuries B.C. more Greek-speaking Indo-Europeans arrived, coming westward across the Aegean in ships. They were Homer's "divine born" heroes, the fathers and grandfathers of the warriors who sacked Troy about 1,250 B.C.: golden-haired Achilles, the sons of Atreus, and the other princes and kings of the *Iliad*. They settled in Greece, founded dynasties, and lived in a manner remarkably like that of northern Europe's feudal lords more than twenty centuries later.

A couple of generations after the fall of Troy—exactly eighty years afterward, according to Greek tradition—a new group of divine-born warriors swept down on Greece, this time from the north. They were the Heracleidae, the supposed descendants of the blond demigod Hercules, and with them came the Dorians, the last of the major Hellenic tribes to reach the Aegean region.

The Dorians, who had settled in central Greece a few years earlier, proceeded to conquer the Achaeans, occupy the Peloponnesus, and extinguish Mycenaean civilization. But, in so doing, they prepared the way for the rise of a new civilization which would greatly surpass the old one. Displaced Achaeans, Aeolians, and Ionians migrated to new areas, sometimes displacing those people already there and sometimes amalgamating with them.

The Dorians were blonder than the Achaeans they conquered, but that is only because the Achaeans had been mixing with the Mediterranean aborigines for several centuries before the Dorians arrived; originally the two tribes had been of the same racial composition.

But the Achaeans were certainly more civilized than the rude, new arrivals from the north, and it was 400 years before Greece recovered from the cultural shock of the Dorian invasion.

Historians' Bias. The four centuries between the Dorian invasion and the flowering of the literate Classical civilization are referred to by most historians as "the Dark Age," for

much the same reasons that the period between the fall of Rome, more than fifteen centuries later, and the flowering of Mediaeval civilization is also called “the Dark Ages.”

In both cases a people of an older civilization, who had begun to succumb to racial mixing and decadence, was overwhelmed by a more vigorous and racially healthier but culturally less advanced people from the north. And in both cases a period of gestation took place over a dozen generations or so, during which a synthesis of old and new elements, racial and cultural, occurred, before a new and different civilization arose from the ruins of the old.

Unfortunately, most historians tacitly assume that the records of political and cultural activity which have come down to us from periods of civilized literacy provide all the data needed to yield an understanding of the historical process. The state of development and degree of organization and complexity of city life are taken as a yardstick by which to evaluate the significance or historical importance of a particular period. And if one's standards of value are geared to such things as the volume of commerce, the gross national product, or even the intensity of scientific, literary, and artistic activity, such a yardstick may seem, at first glance, to be proper.

But there are other standards of value, such as those of the *National Alliance*, which differ somewhat from the customary ones. For it is not in the external forms of organization and activity of a people that we see the most important criteria for making a judgment as to the significance of a particular period, but rather in the actual racial constitution of a people and in the dynamic processes which, for better or worse, are influencing that racial constitution.

Although the basic racial constitution of a people is always intimately related to that people's achievements in commerce, science, industry, art, politics, and warfare, still the two sets of criteria can lead to fundamentally different evaluations of a given historical period. This is a consequence of the fact that race building and decay are usually strongly out of phase with civilization building and decay.

Thus, the long ages between the periods of maximum civil activity—ages which the historian customarily ignores as being of only slight importance—may very well be periods of the greatest interest from a standpoint of racial dynamics.

It is, of course, true that the periods of maximum civil activity are precisely those which yield a maximum of written records, artifacts, and the other raw materials from which the historian builds his tale. But relative abundance of evidence should not be interpreted as equivalent to relative historical significance, regardless of the historian's value criteria.

The record of the rise and fall of pure races constitutes the primary history of mankind, and the rise and fall of civilizations occupy a place of secondary importance. This

statement may seem self-evident to those already accustomed to looking at history from a racial viewpoint, but it is by no means generally accepted by historians today. Until it is, much historical writing will continue to be flawed in a fundamental way.

Sparta. The Dorians of Laconia organized the Peloponnesian population in a three-layered hierarchy. At the top were the citizens of Sparta, the Spartiates, all of pure Dorian blood, ruled by their kings.

At the bottom of the social structure were the Helots, or serfs, consisting of the aboriginal Mediterranean elements as well as many of the conquered Achaeans of mixed blood. No Spartiate could engage in trade or practice a craft. The Perioeci handled all their commerce, and the Helots provided all their other needs.

Sparta thus had the only full-time, professional army in the Aegean world, and this fact gave her an influence vastly disproportionate to her numbers. So thoroughly did Sparta dominate all her neighbors, and so thoroughly feared and respected by all other Greeks for their military prowess were the Spartiates, that for more than 800 years the city had no need of walls or an acropolis, in marked contrast to every other Greek city of those times.

For another thing, the Spartiates gave an emphasis to racial fitness which went far beyond the needs of a strong and efficient army. Their eugenics program placed a premium on physical beauty—on aesthetic qualities, not just on raw strength or robustness. Spartan women, for example, were a far cry from the muscle-bound behemoths one sees on Soviet women's Olympic teams these days; instead, they were judged by other Greeks to be among the most beautiful and graceful, as well as the fairest, of Hellenic women, rivaled in beauty only by the women of Thebes.

Another Spartan practice which suggests that racial rather than imperialistic motives may have been uppermost in the minds of their leaders was the regular thinning out of the Helot population, in what was known as the *crypteia*. This admirable institution sent teams of young Spartiates out into the countryside with daggers to dispatch Helots by the hundreds—an undertaking hardly consonant with a desire for as many subjects as possible, which is the norm for imperialists.

It is easy to imagine the Spartiates, upon their arrival in Laconia, surveying the moral decadence and the racemixing which had made the Achaeans such an easy conquest for the Dorians, and then instituting a carefully designed program to safeguard themselves from a similar fate. For a time this program succeeded; the moral character and the racial quality of the Spartiates remained famously high. But ultimately it failed in both regards.

As with other ruling classes at other times, the Spartiates did not produce enough children to make up for their losses in war. Even heavy penalties for celibacy and late marriage, and

exemption from taxes for those Spartan families with four or more children, did not solve the problem.

At the beginning of the fifth century B.C. the Spartiates were able to field an army of 8,000 men against the Persians, but after the costly Spartan victory over Athens and her allies in the Peloponnesian War (431-404 B.C.) Spartan numbers declined rapidly. When the Spartiates marched against Thebes in 371 B.C., there were too few of them to prevail. After their decisive defeat by the Thebans at Leuctra, the Spartan army numbered only 2,000 warriors. A century and a half later there were only 700 of them, and they passed from the pages of history.

The Spartiates never succumbed to racemixing, but they did succumb to their own lifestyle. They would have been well advised to eliminate the Helots of the Peloponnesus and the Mediterranean population of Crete altogether and to establish a purely Dorian peasant class in those areas. Then they may well have been able to practice a successful eugenics program, maintain their moral health, and have a stable population too. But, of course, they did not have the advantage which hindsight gives us.

The other Hellenic tribes did succumb to racemixing. Their populations did not suffer the decline in numbers which the Spartiates did, but they suffered a decline in racial quality which resulted in their extermination, perhaps more slowly but just as surely—and less cleanly.

Athens. Athens was Sparta's great political rival during much of the Classical Age. Athenian society came to be organized along quite different lines from Spartan society, but at the dawn of Greek history the similarities outweighed the differences.

The earliest Athenians were, like the other Hellenes, predominantly Nordic in blood and culture. Their social structure was aristocratic, and they were ruled originally by hereditary kings, just as in the case of the Spartiates.

In the seventh century there were two principal differences, from a racial viewpoint, between Sparta and Athens. The first difference, in favor of Sparta, was a culturally and racially more homogeneous class of citizens in Sparta than in Athens. The second was that Athens had a free citizen-peasantry—a decided plus for her.

By the beginning of the sixth century, however, the Athenian peasants were in danger of losing their freedom, many of them having already been sold into slavery and others being effectively chained by indebtedness.

The social unrest resulting from this situation led the Athenians to give absolute power to Solon, a nobleman, in the hope that he could improve things. Solon gave Athens a

constitution which wrought a number of changes with long-lasting effects, some good and some bad. On the positive side, he outlawed the practice of enslavement for indebtedness. But he also took the decisive step of transferring the power of the Athenian state from the hands of the aristocracy into the hands of a plutocracy.

Although this latter change was only *de jure* at first, since the aristocrats were also the plutocrats, it shifted the ultimate criterion of fitness to rule from blood to gold. Henceforth, any sufficiently wealthy speculator who had acquired enough land to yield the specified amount of agricultural produce could theoretically qualify for the highest office in the state and for membership in the Council of the Areopagus: the highest judicial body in Athens, made up of nobles who had formerly held the office of *archon*, or ruler.

Even after Solon, however, democracy did not devour the Athenians all at once. Solon and the tyrants who gained power shortly after his administration, the Peisistratids, governed an Athens in which citizenship was still a racial matter, being based on membership in one of the kinship groups, or clans, which made up the Hellenic tribes of Attica.

In 509 B.C., 85 years after the beginning of Solon's administration, another "reformer," Cleisthenes, took office, and he undertook a program of gerrymandering which laid the basis for changing citizenship from a racial to a geographic affair. From this point it was downhill all the way for Athens, racially speaking.

Half a century later the last remnants of power were transferred from the Areopagus to a popular council. All the abuses of mass party politics with which Americans are all too familiar were thenceforth the lot of the Athenians.

As the prosperity of Athens grew, more and more foreigners crowded into Attica, with intermarriage inevitably occurring. A temporary halt to the pollution of the Athenian citizenry by the offspring of aliens came in 451 B.C., when the great Pericles pushed through a law restricting citizenship to those born of an Athenian father and an Athenian mother. Only four decades later, however, in order to make up the enormous losses suffered in the Peloponnesian War, Athens bestowed citizenship on tens of thousands of foreigners.

And in the fourth century, although the citizenship law of Pericles remained on the books, every variety of Levantine mongrel was claiming Athenian citizenship. The banking industry of Athens, for example, was entirely in the hands of Semites, who had taken Greek names and were awarded citizenship for "service to the state," much in the way Jews and Negroes have been elevated to the British "nobility" by the score in recent decades.

Darkening of Hellas. Intermarriage was rife, and the darkening of the Hellenes of Athens was well under way. Racial, moral, and cultural decline went hand in hand. The second-century historian Polybius described his countrymen as “degenerate, pleasure-seeking beggars, without loyalty or belief, and without hope for a better future.”

In the reign of Augustus, the Roman writer Manilius reckoned the Hellenes among the dark nations (*coloratae genies*). And so the Athenians, like the Spartiates, passed from the pages of history.

If it is difficult to believe that as great a state as Athens could pass from Nordic genius and glory to mongrelized squalor in a few centuries, just think for a moment of the racial transformation of America which has taken place in a single century. And imagine what America will be like two or three centuries hence (barring a White revolution), when Whites are a minority, outnumbered by both Blacks and Chicanos. America's technology and industry may coast along for a century or two on the momentum acquired from earlier generations, as Athens' culture did, but the American people—the real Americans—will have passed from the pages of history.

The passing of the Hellenes must be regarded as one of the greatest tragedies of our race. A great-hearted and noble people, filled with genius and energy, they seized upon the resources in labor, material, and land which their conquest of the conservative Mediterranean world offered, and they wrought one of the most progressive civilizations this earth has yet seen. Indeed, many of their creations remain unsurpassed to this day.

This catastrophic mixing of bloods has occurred over and over again in the history and prehistory of our race, and each time it has been lethal. The knowledge of this has been with us a long time, but it has always failed us in the end. The Hellenes of Sparta and Athens both strove to keep their blood pure, but both ultimately perished. The only way they could have survived would have been to eliminate the entire indigenous population, either through expulsion or extermination, from the areas of the Mediterranean world in which they settled.

The Hellenes always possessed a certain feeling of racial unity, distinguishing themselves sharply from all those not of their blood, but this racial feeling was, unfortunately, usually overshadowed by intraracial conflicts. The rivalries between Hellenic city-states were so fierce and so pervasive, that the Mediterranean natives were more often looked upon as a resource to be used against other Hellenes than as a biological menace to be eliminated.

*Indo-Europeans Conquered Middle East, Perished through Racemixing
Mighty Hittite Empire Was Built by Nordics, Destroyed by Nordics
Aryan Warriors Ruled Persian Empire, India
Only Total Separation Can Preserve Racial Quality*

Before we deal with the next Indo-European peoples of the Classical Age—the Macedonians and the Romans—let us review briefly the history of our race to this point, and let us also look at the fate of some Indo-Europeans who, unlike those we have already studied, invaded Asia instead of Europe.

Around the middle of the fifth millennium B.C., a new racial type made its first impact on Old Europe. The people of this type were taller and more rugged than the White Mediterraneans, but not so tall or rugged as the Cro-Magnons. They were the Nordics, and 7,000 years ago they occupied a large area in Russia, mostly steppeland, north of the Black Sea and between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea. Their language was Proto-Indo-European, from which Greek and Latin and the great Germanic, Celtic, and Slavic language families of Europe evolved. They were an extraordinarily energetic people, who hunted, farmed, and raised livestock. In particular, they domesticated horses, riding them and using them to pull their swift, light, two-wheeled chariots over the grassy plains.

When these Nordic horsemen of the northern steppes (or battle-axe people, as they have been called) outgrew their grassy homeland, some of them migrated westward into Europe. We have followed the fortunes of these migrants in earlier chapters in this series. But some moved east and south, into Asia instead of Europe. We do not know when the first of these movements occurred or when the Nordics first made contact with the Mediterranean peoples of the Middle East.

Sumer and Babylon. The Sumerians, who built the first literate civilization in the Middle East, around 3,500 B.C., were Mediterraneans, not Nordics. Their language was unique, related neither to any Indo-European tongue nor to the Semitic languages of the indigenous population of the Middle East.

We do not know whether the Elamites, a non-Semitic Mediterranean people of southeastern Mesopotamia and western Iran, were ruled by Indo-Europeans. But we do know that several Mediterranean peoples of the Middle East were indeed conquered and ruled by a Nordic elite. Among these were the Hittites, the Kassites, and the Hurrians.

There are no written records of the first few centuries after the Nordic conquest of the Hatti; the Hittites entered history in the 17th century B.C., when King Labarnas ruled. They began being mentioned in the records of their Semitic neighbors, who were becoming increasingly alarmed as Hittite squadrons raided further and further afield.

Not only had the Hittites become skilled in *blitzkrieg* tactics with their war chariots, making lightning raids across the mountains and down into the plains of northern Mesopotamia and Syria, but they fought with weapons of a new kind, previously unknown to their Semitic foes: iron weapons. The Hittites ushered in the Iron Age.

Although the Semitic armies of the plains could not stand up against the Hittite warriors and their chariots on the battlefield, the plains cities were heavily fortified; if the Semites could reach the safety of their walls, the fast-moving Hittite squadrons could not harm them. So the Hittites taught themselves the tactics of siege warfare. The first major city to fall to them was Aleppo, capital of the Semitic kingdom of Yamkhad, in northern Syria.

A few years later, in 1595 B.C., the Hittites, under King Mursilis, captured mighty Babylon, which lay a full 500 miles southeast of Aleppo. The Semites were taken completely by surprise, and the fast-moving Hittite army burned and plundered the most powerful Semitic capital. The Hittites, unfortunately, were not numerous enough to adequately garrison their conquest, and so they had to withdraw to the north again with their booty, leaving Babylon to be occupied and ruled by the Kassites.

New Blood: Phrygians and People of the Sea. In succeeding centuries the Hittites built a mighty empire in the Middle East which lasted until about 1,200 B.C. As was so often the case with other empires founded by Indo-Europeans, the proximate cause of the demise of the Hittite empire was the appearance on the scene of a new group of Indo-Europeans who had not yet polluted their blood through racemixing—in this case, the Phrygians.

Toward the end of the 13th century the Phrygians came around the western end of the Black Sea and crossed over into Asia Minor from Macedonia. Their Indo-European cousins, the Dorians, may well have been their traveling companions, until the paths of the two groups separated in Macedonia, with the Dorians continuing southward to conquer the Achaeans of the Peloponnesus, while the Phrygians turned eastward to conquer the Hittites.

At about the same time, a group of Indo-European invaders—part of a larger group given the name “Peoples of the Sea” by the Egyptians—landed on the coast of southern Canaan, conquered the local Semites, and established a kingdom. They were the Philistines, from whom came the modern name of the territory they occupied: Palestine.

The exact origin of the Peoples of the Sea is not known with certainty. About all that can be said is that they had previously lived in the Aegean area: on the Greek mainland, the coast of Asia Minor, or the Aegean islands. In any event, they were Indo-Europeans—Nordic White men who had come into the Aegean area from north of the Black Sea at some earlier time.

The Philistines eventually extended their hegemony over the Semitic Israelites, who were their neighbors, and exacted tribute from the Israelite cities. The Israelites in turn regarded the Philistines as arch-enemies and hated them as only Jews can. Thus arose the Old Testament slurs against the Philistines, leading to the use of the word “Philistine” in a derogatory sense even today by Indo-Europeans raised on an unhealthy diet of Jewish mythology. Every White man, woman, and child should understand that, on the contrary, the Philistines were the “good guys” in that ancient conflict between Aryan and Semite—a conflict which has continued unabated to this day. (The modern Palestinians, of course, bear as little resemblance to the ancient Philistines as the modern inhabitants of north-eastern Syria do to the ancient Mitanni.)

Because this elite generally chose to conquer and rule, rather than to exterminate, they invariably fell victim to racemixing and eventual absorption into the non-Indo-European masses. Today their only traces are to be found in an occasional gray-eyed or blue-eyed or green-eyed Turk or Syrian, a fair-haired Iraqi or Palestinian.

In the cases of those peoples who left extensive records, oral or written, which have come down to us, it is plain that the failure of the Indo-Europeans who invaded the Middle East and other parts of Asia to maintain their stock unmixed was not due to a lack of racial consciousness: there was always a strong awareness of the fundamental differences between themselves and the non-Indo-European peoples around them. Nor was it due to any milksop morality, any turn-the-other-cheek doctrine of pacifism or false humanitarianism which kept them from extirpating the alien gene pool in order to preserve the integrity of their own.

Economics Over Race. The ultimate downfall of the Nordic conquerors in Asia, just as in the Mediterranean world, can be traced to an economic consideration and to an error in human judgment.

The economic consideration was that a conquered population, just like the land itself or the gold and other booty seized by the conquerors, had real value. Whether the people were enslaved or merely taxed as subjects, they were an economic resource which could be exploited by the conquerors. To drive them off the land or wipe them out completely would, from a strictly economic viewpoint, be akin to dumping captured gold into the ocean.

Such an action could be justified to a conquering tribe of Indo-Europeans only if they were willing to subordinate all economic considerations to the goal of maintaining their racial integrity into the indefinite future—and if they also had a sufficiently deep understanding of history to foresee the inevitability of racial mixing wherever two races are in close proximity. Unfortunately, even where the will for racial survival was very strong, the foresight was insufficient. Measures which were quite adequate to prevent

racemixing for a few generations, or even for a few centuries, broke down over the course of a thousand years or more.

The foregoing remarks are especially well illustrated by the fate of a related group of Indo-European tribes whose members called themselves Aryans. Although the name “Aryan” is sometimes used to designate any person of Indo-European ancestry, it applies especially to the tribes which, beginning probably in the third millennium B.C., migrated eastward and southeastward from the ancient Nordic homeland, some going down through Turkistan and into Iran from the northeast—and some into the more easterly foothills of the Hindu Kush, in what is now Afghanistan.

The high Iranian plateau, much of it covered with grass, provided an ideal territory for the horsemen from the northern steppes. They multiplied and prospered, raiding their non-Indo-European neighbors in the Zagros Mountains or on the edge of the Sumerian plain from time to time, collecting slaves and booty. They maintained their racial purity scrupulously enough, however, so that, as late as the middle of the first millennium B.C., King Darius the Great could still proudly and truthfully boast: “I am an Aryan, the son of an Aryan.”

But Semites and other aliens became more numerous in Iran as the might and wealth of the Aryan Persians grew. In the reign of Darius’ son Xerxes, as we know from the Old Testament’s Book of Esther, Jews were already quite influential there. Today, 2,500 years later, the Iranians are no more Aryan than their Semitic neighbors, so thoroughly have the genes of the various races in that part of the world been mixed.

Conquest of India. To the east, in India, the details were different, but the outcome was the same. In the 16th century B.C. there was a thriving, non-White civilization in the Indus valley, with centers at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa. Trade was carried on with countries as far away as Egypt.


Then the Aryans came across the towering, ice-covered Hindu Kush in the north and fell upon the dwellers in the southern valleys with irresistible ferocity. First Harappa, and then Mohenjo-daro, was razed, and the Indo-Europeans were in possession of the rich Land of the Seven Rivers.

It was yet another land whose aboriginal inhabitants differed profoundly from the Indo-European conquerors, both physically and spiritually. And in this new land the Aryans made as determined an effort as anywhere to avoid racemixing.

The tribal society of the Nordic invaders was already organized hierarchically into three estates, or castes: the priests, the warriors (from whom came the rulers), and the workers (farmers, craftsmen, and merchants). After the conquest of the Indian aborigines (or

dasyus, as the Aryans called them), a fourth estate was added: that of the servants, the hewers of wood and the fetchers of water.

The estates, which among the Aryans had been somewhat flexible, offering the possibility of social movement from one estate to another, became fixed in an absolutely rigid caste system. Not only intermarriage, but every form of social intercourse between the castes except that absolutely necessary for the functioning of society, was banned, and the ban had the authority of religion as well as of law.



The Sanskrit literature of the ancient Aryans is filled with references to the distaste the Nordic conquerors felt for the dark, flat-nosed natives. Poets referred to the *dasyus* as “the noseless ones” and “the blackskins.” One poet wrote, “Destroying the *dasyus*, Indra (the ancient Aryan god of the sky, cognate with the Hellenic Zeus and Roman Jupiter, head of the Aryan pantheon prior to the rise of Brahmanism) protected the Aryan color.” According to another poet, “Indra protected in battle the Aryan worshipper... he conquered the blackskin.” And still another: “He (Indra) beat the *dasyus* as is his wont... He conquered the land with his white friends.”

The Sanskrit literature, incidentally, has preserved for us the most extensive sample of an Indo-European language from the second millennium B.C. (assuming that the earliest *Vedas*, which were originally transmitted orally, were fixed in their present form sometime prior to 1,000 B.C.). Many common Sanskrit words are quite similar to common words of the same or similar meaning in the classical or modern European languages, thus illustrating the unity of the Indo-European peoples and their languages over the enormous area of the earth’s surface which they eventually covered.

Unfortunately, the Aryans of ancient India were far more successful in preserving their language than their racial integrity. The Brahmans and Kshatriyas of the India of today are lighter, on the average, than the Untouchables, and there are a number of individuals in northern India who are practically White in their coloring and features—but, nevertheless, the Aryans are gone forever. All their initial determination and all the rigidity of the caste

system were insufficient to prevent a mixing of genes over the span of thirty-five centuries.

The insidiousness of the destruction of a race through racemixing lies in the gradualness with which it can proceed. In the beginning one has two quite distinct races—one tall and fair, the other short and dark. Keeping the two from mixing genetically seems a simple matter. By the time the damage has become quite noticeable, racial decadence has become irreversible. The subtle but essential qualities of psyche and intellect in the Aryans which led to conquest and to the building of Aryan civilization are diluted to ineffectiveness in their almost-Aryan descendants fifteen or twenty centuries later, even though fair hair and blue eyes may still be abundant.

That is what happened to Aryan Persia and Aryan India. And it is also what is happening to Aryan America and Aryan Europe today.

*Macedonian and Roman Empires Were Built by Nordics
Latin Founders of Rome Came from Central Europe*

The last five chapters in this series have dealt with the migrations of Nordic, Indo-European-speaking tribes from their homeland in southern Russia, beginning more than 6,000 years ago and continuing into early historic times. In chapter 11 we traced the fate of those Nordics who invaded Asia, conquering races which differed substantially from them and eventually being absorbed by those races, despite strong measures for self-preservation.

Only those Nordics who migrated westward, into Europe rather than into Asia, have left a significant genetic heritage. And only those who went northwestward predominated genetically in the long run. Along the shores of the Mediterranean the population density of non-Nordic natives was too high, and racial mixing eventually overwhelmed the invaders. We have already seen what happened to the Greeks.

To the north and northeast of Greece, from the head of the Aegean Sea to the eastern shore of the Adriatic Sea, other Nordic peoples from beyond the Black Sea settled. Among these peoples were the Illyrians, the Dacians, the Thracians, and the Macedonians. Very roughly, the Illyrians occupied the territory comprising much of present-day Yugoslavia and Albania; the Dacians occupied the loop of the lower Danube, in what is now Romania; the Thracians occupied Bulgaria and European Turkey; and the Macedonians occupied the territory between Albania and Bulgaria, comprising the Macedonian provinces of Yugoslavia and Greece. This was a greatly varied territory, and

consequently the Nordic inhabitants, though closely related in blood and culture, experienced varied fates.

As we noted in earlier chapters, this territory was the site of the Mediterranean Neolithic culture known as Old Europe, which arose about 8,000 years ago and lasted until the first Nordic invasions, which came during the late fifth and early fourth millennia B.C. The early invasions were numerically thin, however, and resulted, in many parts of this Balkan area, in a situation with which we are already familiar: a Nordic warrior elite ruling masses of indigenous Mediterranean farmers and craftsmen.

This situation led to a great deal of racial and cultural blending. The languages of the Nordics prevailed everywhere, but their blood and their religion became mixed with those of the Mediterraneans. For example, even as late as historic times, when further invasions had greatly reinforced the Nordic racial element in the area, the Thracian religion remained a strongly interwoven blend of Mediterranean Earth Mother elements and Nordic Sky Father elements. In the case of the Greeks the Nordic elements had prevailed, but in the case of the Thracians the Mediterranean elements, with their serpent-phallic symbolism and orgiastic rites, played a much larger role.

Both geography and the inhomogeneous racial pattern of the area worked against political unity, and the Balkan region, in ancient times just as in recent times, remained balkanized. Only in Macedonia did a strong enough central authority arise and maintain itself long enough to have a major impact on the world beyond this corner of Europe.

Macedonia. Ancient Macedonia consisted principally of an inland, mountain-and-plateau region (Upper Macedonia), and a grassy plain at the head of the Thermaic Gulf (Gulf of Salonika) spanning the valleys of the lower Haliacmon (Vistritsa) and Axios (Vardar) Rivers. The Macedonian plain provided ideal conditions for the Nordic horsemen from the steppe of southern Russia.

In the middle of the 12th century B.C. the Dorian invasion swept through Macedonia on its southward course, and a large contingent of Dorians remained in the Macedonian plain, pushing much of the earlier population of Greeks, Thracians, and Illyrians into Upper Macedonia.

After a half-millennium of consolidation, the Macedonian kingdom was born. The first Macedonian king, Perdiccas I, unified the Dorians and the other tribes of the plain and brought them under his control around 640 B.C. Three centuries later King Philip II brought Upper Macedonia into the kingdom as well. The Macedonians in the fourth century B.C. still had the vigor which decadence had drained from the Greeks of the south, and Philip was able to establish Macedonian hegemony over the greater portion of

the Balkan peninsula. In 338 B.C., in the battle of Chaeronea, he crushed the Greek armies, and Macedonia became a world power.

But it was Philip's son, Alexander, who used this power base to launch a new and vastly greater wave of Nordic conquest. In 336, at the age of twenty, he succeeded his father as king of Macedonia. Within a decade he had conquered most of the ancient world.

Alexander's principal conquests lay in the Middle East, however, in the area treated in the previous chapter: Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Iran, Afghanistan, and the Aryan realm of northwest India. The greater portion of this territory had already been conquered by the Persians, under Cyrus the Great, two centuries earlier. By bringing it under common rule with Greece and Macedonia, Alexander created the greatest empire the world had yet seen.

Unfortunately, despite his military and organizational genius, Alexander did not understand the racial basis of civilization. He dreamed of a unified world-empire, with all its diverse races expressing a single culture and ordered by a single rule. At a great feast of reconciliation between Greeks and Persians at Opis, on the Tigris River some 40 miles above Baghdad, in 324 B.C., when his conquests were complete, he stated his dream explicitly. And throughout his brief but uniquely dynamic career of empire-building, Alexander acted consistently with this dream. He adopted Asiatic customs and dress, blending them with the Macedonian lifestyle and requiring many of his officers to do the same. He left in power many of the native satraps of the conquered regions, after receiving their oaths of loyalty. And it was not Macedonian Pella, but Semitic Babylon which he chose as the capital of his empire.

Alexander preached racemixing, and he practiced it. During the conquest of Sogdiana (comprising the modern Uzbek and Tadzhik Republics of the U.S.S.R.) he took to wife the daughter, Roxane, of a local baron. Four years later, at Susa he also married the daughter of the defeated Persian king, Darius II. On that occasion he bade his officers and men to imitate him; nearly a hundred of the former and 10,000 of the latter took native brides in a mass marriage.

Alexander's brides, and presumably those of his officers as well, were of noble Persian blood, which, even as late as the fourth century B.C., meant most of them were White—Nordic, in fact. But certainly most of the 10,000 brides of his soldiers were not; they were Asiatics: Semites and the bastard offspring of Semites and Aryans and a dozen other races.

On June 13, 323 B.C., at Babylon, Alexander, not yet 33 years ears old, died of a fever—and with him died the unnatural dream of a mixed-race universal empire. Most of his Macedonian troops at once repudiated their Asiatic wives. His satraps began revolting. The various plans he had set in motion for homogenizing the culture and government of his vast realm became sidetracked.

Elements of Alexander's empire survived long after his death. In Egypt, for example, the Macedonian Ptolemaic dynasty lasted three centuries; Queen Cleopatra was not an Egyptian by blood, but a Macedonian. And in the east, after the breakup of the empire, local rulers claimed descent from Alexander, even as late as modern times.

But the far-flung empire itself had no natural unity, no unity of blood or spirit; and even if Alexander had lived long enough to impose an artificial unity of coinage and dress and language and custom, it would still have required the strength of his unique personality to hold it together. And it is well that the empire died with him; otherwise it might have sucked the best blood out of Europe for centuries, in a vain effort to maintain it.



The attractions of the vast and rich Orient for one Nordic conqueror after another are obvious. What is unfortunate is that none made racial considerations the basis of his program of conquest—and it could have been done.

Alexander, for example, could have laid the foundations for a Nordic empire which could have stood against the rest of the world—including Rome—forever. The Macedonians and the Greeks shared common blood and had similar languages (ancient Macedonian was an altogether different language from modern Macedonian, which has its roots in the sixth century A.D. conquest of Macedonia by Slavic tribes). If, before invading Asia and defeating the Asian armies, Alexander had devoted his energies to forging just these two peoples into a unified population base, casting out all the alien elements which had accumulated in Greece by the latter part of the fourth century B.C.; and if, while conquering Asia, he had carried out a policy of total extermination—then he could have colonized Asia with Nordic settlements from the Indus to the Nile, and they could have multiplied freely and expanded into the empty lands without danger of racial mixing.

But Alexander did not cleanse Greece of its Semitic merchants and moneylenders and its accumulated rabble of half-breeds, and he chose to base his Asiatic empire on the indigenous populations instead of on colonists. And so the Greco-Macedonian world, despite its uninterrupted prosperity and its maintenance of the appearance of might after

Alexander's death, continued its imperceptible downward slide toward oblivion. The focus of history shifted to the west, to the Italian peninsula.

Nordic Virtues Led Romans to World Domination
Etruscan Kings Paved Way for Rome's Fall
Levantines, Decadence, Capitalism Sank Rome

Today, when we speak of "Latins," we reflexively think of short, swarthy, excitable people who are inordinately fond of loud rhythms, wine, spicy food, and seduction, and who aren't to be taken very seriously. That is not an accurate image of all speakers of Romance languages, of course. Many individuals of French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and Romanian nationality are as racially sound as the average Swede or German. Yet, the image persists, and for good reason.

But the *Latini*, the Northern tribesmen who settled *Latium* in the ninth century B.C. and founded Rome a century later, were something altogether different. Most of today's Latins share nothing with those of twenty-eight centuries ago except the name. Not only are the two strikingly different in appearance and temperament, but every element of the culture the original Latins created as an expression of their race-soul has been fundamentally transformed by those who claim that name today.

Above all, the *Latini* were a people to be taken seriously. They brought with them to Italy the spirit of the northern forests whence they had come. They took themselves and life very seriously indeed. Duty, honor, responsibility: to the early Romans these were the elements which circumscribed a man's life. Their virtues (the Latin root of the word means "manliness") were strength of body and will, perseverance, sobriety, courage, hardiness, steadiness of purpose, attentiveness to detail, intelligence, and the characteristically Nordic will to order. Through these virtues they brought the world under their sway and created a civic edifice of such magnificence that it has ever since provided the standard against which all others are measured.

The Romans shaped the world around them—its institution, its politics, its attitudes, and its lifestyles—more extensively and more profoundly than anyone else has, and then they perished. That fact has fascinated and occupied the energies of historical scholars as no other topic. What were the reasons that the Romans rose so high and then fell so far?

The *populus Romanus*, it should be noted, did not include every inhabitant of Rome. Initially, in fact, it included only those persons who were blood members of a *gens*: i.e., the nobles, or patricians. After the individual households (*familiae*), the *gentes* were the fundamental social units among the early Romans, just as among the other Indo-European

peoples. Their origin predates the Latin invasion of Italy; those persons born into them were, thus, all descendants of the warrior clans which originally seized the land and subjugated the aborigines.

The members of this warrior nobility, the patricians, were originally the whole people; to them belonged everything: land, livestock, religion, and law. They alone possessed a clan name (*nomen gentilicium*) and the right to display a coat of arms (*jus imaginum*).

Those who were not patricians, and, hence, not members of the *populus Romanus*, were the plebeians (*plebs*). Although not originally permitted to participate in the political or religious institutions of the *populus*, the plebeians were technically free. Many of them were the pre-Latin inhabitants of the seven hills beside the Tiber on which Rome was built; some undoubtedly came into the area later, as Rome's influence grew. No direct evidence remains on the matter, but it nevertheless seems certain that there was a racial as well as a social difference between patricians and plebeians, with the latter having much less Nordic blood than the former.

Several social and political developments worked to diminish the racial distinction between patrician and plebeian with the passage of time. One of these developments was the patron-client relationship; another was the incorporation of an Etruscan element into the Roman population, including the acceptance of a number of *gentes* of Etruscan nobles into the Roman patrician class; a third was the extension of citizenship to the plebs.

As the social bond between patricians and plebeians grew, the social distance lessened. Many plebeians became, through hard work and good fortune, wealthy enough to rival the patrician class in their standard of living. And, although marriage between patrician and plebeian was strictly forbidden, there was nevertheless a flow of patrician genes into the plebeian class as a result of irregular liaisons between patrician men and plebeian women.

Latins, Sabines, Etruscans. Very early in its history, Romulus' hilltop village of Latins joined forces with a neighboring village of Sabines, the Titienses. The Sabines and the Latins were of very closely related Indo-European stocks, and the amalgamation did little to change social institutions, other than doubling the number of senators.

A few years later, however, the Etruscan Luceres—of non-Indo-European stock—were absorbed by the growing Rome. Although the Etruscans remained a tribe apart from the Latin and Sabine inhabitants of the city, without patrician status, this condition was destined not to last.

It was Tarquin's successor, Servius Tullius, who wrought changes which were to have much more profound racial consequences: in essence, Servius made the plebs a part of the *populus Romanus*. He accomplished this by overshadowing the patrician assembly, the

Comitia Curiata, with two new popular assemblies, one civil and one military. For administrative purposes, Servius divided the city and its territory into thirty “tribes.” These thirty administrative divisions, or wards, were tribal in name only, however; they were based solely on geography, and not on birth. The patricians still ruled in the new *Comitia Tributa*, or tribal assembly, and provided the magistrates for the new wards, but Servius had laid the same groundwork for future political gains by the Roman plebs which Cleisthenes, just a few decades later, laid in Athens by reorganizing the tribal basis of the Athenian state along purely geographical lines.

Servius certainly cannot be accused of being a democrat. Yet he clearly initiated the process which eventually led to the ascendancy of gold over blood in Roman society, just as Solon had done in Athens a few years earlier.

The successor of Servius Tullius, Tarquinius Superbus (Tarquin the Proud), partly repealed the changes the former had made. And Tarquin the Proud’s reign marked the end of Etruscan domination of Rome, as well as the end of the monarchy. The Tarquins were driven out of Rome by the Latins and Sabines in 509 B.C. (according to tradition), and the Roman Republic was born. But the Etruscan kings (among whom Servius is included, although his origins and ethnicity are uncertain) had brought about two lasting changes which were racially significant: the Roman aristocracy of Indo-European Latins and Sabines had received a substantial non-Indo-European admixture by the admission of the nobility of the Luceres to patrician status, and the principle that citizenship (and its attendant rights and powers) should belong solely to the members of a racial elite had been compromised.

The following centuries saw the political power of the plebs increase greatly relative to that of the patricians, while wealth continued to gain weight relative to race and family. The Romans survived the founding of the Republic by roughly a millennium, but we are not concerned in this series with the political and cultural details of their history, except as these details have a salient racial significance. Therefore, the emphasis in the following historical summary is rather different than that found in most textbooks on Roman history.

Let us focus on four factors: first, the growing racial diversity of the Roman state; second, the eventual decadence of Rome’s patricians; third, the differential in birthrates between Rome’s patrician and plebeian classes; and fourth, the effects on the Roman peasantry of large-scale slavery as a capitalist institution.

Non-White Immigration. The Romans were an energetic and martial people, and the power, influence, and wealth which they wielded grew enormously during the period from the end of the sixth to the last quarter of the first century B.C., the life-span of the Republic. First all of Italy, then the rest of the Mediterranean world and the Middle East, and finally

much of Nordic Europe came into their possession. This vast area under Roman rule was inhabited by a great diversity of races and peoples. As time passed, the rights of citizenship were extended to more and more of them. Citizens or not, there was a huge influx of foreign peoples into Rome and the other parts of Italy. Some came as slaves, the spoils of Rome's victorious wars, and many came voluntarily, attracted by Rome's growing wealth. After the Republic became the Empire, in the last quarter of the first century B.C., the flow of foreigners into Italy increased still further. The descendants of the Latin founders of Rome became a minority in their own country. Above all other factors, this influx of alien immigrants led to Rome's demise and the extinction of the race which built her into the ruler of the world.

The importance of the immigration factor is, of course, barely mentioned, if at all, in the school history texts being published today, because those who control the content of the textbooks have planned the same fate for White America as that which overtook White Rome.

Nevertheless, the writers of Classical antiquity themselves clearly recognized and wrote about the problem, as do those few of today's professional historians with courage enough to buck the blackout on the mention of race in history. An example of the latter is the distinguished Swedish historian Martin Nilsson, for many years professor at the University of Lund. In his *Imperial Rome*, Nilsson wrote:

Of greater variety than elsewhere was the medley of races in the capital, where individuals congregated from all quarters, either on business with the rulers and the government or as fortune seekers in the great city, where great possibilities were open to all. It is almost impossible for us to realize the extraordinarily motley character of the Roman mob. The only city in our own day which can rival it is Constantinople, the most cosmopolitan town in the world. Numerous passages in the works of Classical authors refer to it, from Cicero, who calls Rome a city formed by the confluence of nations, to Constantius, who, when he visited Rome, marveled at the haste with which all the human beings of the world flocked there...

There were Romans who viewed the population of the capital with deep pessimism. In Nero's time (37-68 A.D.) Lucan said that Rome was not peopled by its own citizens but filled with the scourgings of the world. The Oriental [by Oriental Nilsson means Levantine, not Mongoloid] element seems to have been especially strong.

Jews, in particular, in order to get their hands on the wealth there, flocked to Rome in such enormous numbers that Emperor Tiberius, under pressure from the common people on whom the Jews were preying, was obliged to order them all deported in 19 A.D. The Jews sneaked back in even greater numbers, and Tiberius' brother, Emperor Claudius, was forced to renew the deportation order against them a few years later, but without success. They had become so numerous and so well entrenched that the emperor did not have the energy to dislodge them.

Another distinguished historian, the late Tenney Frank, professor at Bryn Mawr and Johns Hopkins, made a careful survey of Roman tomb inscriptions. He studied 13,900 inscriptions, separating them into categories based on the ethnicity or probable ethnicity indicated by the names and corollary evidence. Professor Frank estimated that by the end of the first century A.D. 90 per cent of the free plebeians in Rome were Levantines or part-Levantines. Fewer than ten per cent could claim unmixed Italian ancestry, and of these even fewer were of pure Indo-European stock.

One problem which Frank ran into was the tendency of non-Italians to disguise their ancestry by changing their names. It was easy enough to separate Greek and Syrian and Hebrew names from Latin ones, but a Latin name which had been adopted rather than inherited could often only be detected by noting the non-Latin names of the parents on the same tomb.

Then too, just as Jewish name-changers today often give themselves away by choosing a non-Jewish first name which has become so popular among their brethren that few non-Jews would dream of burdening their own children with it (Murray, Seymour, Irving are examples), Frank found the same clues among many "Latin" names.

As for the Greek names, the great majority of them did not belong to Hellenes but to Levantines from the remnants of Alexander's Oriental empire. The Roman poet Juvenal (62-142 A.D.) alluded to this when he wrote:

Sirs, I cannot bear
This Rome made Grecian; yet of all her dregs
How much is Greek? Long since Orontes' [a river] stream
Hath fouled our Tiber with his Syrian waters,
Bearing upon his bosom foreign speech
And foreign manners...

C. Northcote Parkinson, the noted author and historian, sums up the effect of centuries of uncontrolled immigration in his *East and West* (1963): "Rome came to be peopled very largely by Levantines, Egyptians, Armenians, and Jews; by astrologers, tipsters, idlers, and crooks." The name "Roman," in other words, came to mean as little as the name "American" is coming to mean today. And yet, just as White Americans are bringing about their downfall through greed and timidity and indifference, so did Rome's patricians cause their own end.


Bread and Circuses. In Rome's earliest days, when the *populus Romanus* was entirely of noble birth, duty, honor, and responsibility counted for everything, as mentioned above. A Roman valued nothing above his honor, put nothing before his obligations to the

community. Even after Rome's conquests brought wealth and luxury to her citizens, her patricians could still produce men like Regulus, stern, honorable, unyielding.

But wealth inexorably undermined the old virtues. Decadence rotted the souls of the noble Romans. While the mongrel mobs were entertained by the debased spectacles in the Colosseum (not unlike the distraction of today's rabble by non-stop television), the patricians indulged themselves with every new vice and luxury that money and a resourceful merchant class could provide. Pampered, perfumed, manicured, and attended by numerous slaves, the effete aristocracy of the first century A.D. was a far cry from the hard and disciplined ruling class of a few centuries earlier.

Just as there are Americans today who understand where the weakness and lack of discipline of their people are leading them and who speak out against these things, so were there Romans who tried to stem the tide of decadence engulfing the Republic. One of these was M. Porcius Cato ("the Censor"), whose public career spanned the first half of the second century B.C.

Cato was born and raised on his father's farm and then spent 26 years fighting in Rome's legions before entering politics. Early in his career, having been appointed governor (*praetor*) of Sardinia, Cato set the pattern he would follow the rest of his life: he expelled all the moneylenders from the island, earning the undying hatred of the Jews and a reputation as a fierce anti-Semite.



Torlonia bust of Cato

Later Cato was elected censor in Rome. The duties of a censor were to safeguard public morality and virtue and to conduct a periodic census of people and property for military and tax purposes. Cato took these duties very seriously. He assessed jewelry and other luxury items at ten times their actual value, and he dealt promptly and severely with disorder and degeneracy.

In the Senate Cato spoke out repeatedly against the foreign influences in philosophy, religion, and lifestyle which were encroaching on the traditional Roman attitudes and

manners. As a result, Rome's "smart set" condemned him (privately, for he was too powerful to attack openly) as an archreactionary and an enemy of "progress."

In the field of foreign policy, Cato was adamantly opposed to the integration of the Semitic East into the Roman world. He wanted Rome to concentrate on the western Mediterranean and to deal with the Levant only at sword point. Unfortunately, there were few men of Cato's fiber left among the Romans by the second century.

Declining Birthrate. One of the most fateful effects of decadence was the drastic decline in the birthrate of the Roman nobility. Decadence is always accompanied by an increase in egoism, a shifting of focus from race and nation to the individual. Instead of looking on bearing and raising children as a duty to the state and a necessity for the perpetuation of their *gens* and tribe, upper-class Romans came to regard children as a hindrance, a limitation on their freedom and pleasure. The "liberation" of women also contributed heavily to this change in outlook.

The failure of the patrician class to reproduce itself alarmed those Roman leaders with a sense of responsibility to the future. Emperor Augustus tried strenuously to reverse the trend by issuing several decrees regarding family life. Heavy penalties were set for celibacy or for marriage with the descendants of slaves. Eventually, Augustus ordered that every noble Roman between the ages of twenty-five and sixty must be married or, at least, betrothed.

In 9 A.D. tax advantages and other preferences were granted to the parents of three or more children; unmarried persons were barred from the public games and could not receive inheritances, while the childless married person could receive only half of any inheritance left to him. All these measures failed. Augustus' own daughter, Julia, was a thoroughly liberated member of the "jet set" of her time, who considered herself far too sophisticated to be burdened with motherhood; in embarrassment, Augustus banished her to an island.

From the dictatorship of Julius Caesar to the reign of Emperor Hadrian, a century and a half, one can trace the destinies of forty-five leading patrician families: all but one died out during that period. Of 400 senatorial families on the public records in 65 A.D., during the reign of Nero, all trace of half of them had vanished by the reign of Nerva, a single generation later.

Rise of Capitalism. As the patricians declined in numbers, the Roman peasantry also suffered, but for a different reason. The later years of the Republic saw the rise of agricultural capitalism, with wealthy entrepreneurs buying up vast estates, working them with slaves and driving the freeborn small farmers out of the marketplace. By the tens of

thousands the Latin and Sabine yeomen were bankrupted and forced to abandon their farms. They fled to the city, where most of them were swallowed up in the urban mob.

The capitalist *nouveaux riches* who came to wield much of the power and influence in Rome lost by the dwindling patricians were an altogether new type of Roman. Petronius' fictional character Trimalchio is their archetype. Tenney Frank wrote of these "new Romans":

It is apparent that at least the political and moral qualities which counted most in the building of the Italian federation, the army organization, the provincial administrative system of the Republic, were the qualities most needed in holding the Empire together. And however brilliant the endowment of the new citizens, these qualities they lacked. The Trimalchios of the Empire were often shrewd and daring businessmen, but their first and obvious task, apparently was to climb by the ladder of quick profits to a social position in which their children, with Romanized names, could comfortably proceed to forget their forebears. The possession of wealth did not, as in the Republic, suggest certain duties toward the commonwealth.

Many historians have remarked on the fact that the entire spirit of the Roman Empire was radically different from that of the Roman Republic. The energy, foresight, common sense, and discipline which characterized the Republic were absent from the Empire. But that was because the race which built the Republic was largely absent from the Empire; it had been replaced by the dregs of the Orient. The change in attitudes, values, and behavior was due to a change in blood. The changing racial composition of Rome during the Republic paved the way for the unchecked influx of Levantine blood, manners, and religion during the Empire.

But it also set the stage for a new ascendancy of the same Northern blood which had first given birth to the Roman people. We will look at the conquest of Rome by the Germans. First, however, we must backtrack and see what had been happening in the North during the rise and fall of Rome.

*One of the Principal Indo-European Peoples Who Founded Europe
Celts Were Fierce Warriors, Master Craftsmen
Roman Conquest Drowned Celtic Europe in Blood*

In the last few chapters we have dealt with those Indo-European peoples which, after leaving their homeland north of the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea, between the Urals and the Dnieper, invaded regions of the world heavily populated by alien races. Some—the Aryans, Kassites, Mitanni, Hittites, Phrygians, and Philistines—went into the Middle East,

conquered the natives, and then gradually sank down into them through racial mixing over the course of millennia.

Others—the Achaeans, Dorians and Latins—went southwest, into the Greek and Italian peninsulas, conquered the aboriginal Mediterraneans already there, and founded the great civilizations of Classical antiquity. Although the racial differences between them and the natives were not as great as for those who went into the Middle East, mixing took its toll of these Indo-Europeans as well, and they gradually lost their original racial character.

The Indo-Europeans who invaded [the north] of Europe were able to remain racially pure, to a much greater extent than their cousins who invaded the more southerly and easterly regions, even to the present day. They established, in effect, a new Indo-European heartland in northern Europe. We shall look at four great divisions of these Indo-European peoples: the Celts, Germans, Balts, and Slavs. These divisions are distinguished one from another by language, geography, and time of appearance on the stage of world history, as well as by their subsequent fates. But one salient fact should be kept in mind throughout the individual treatments of the Celts, Germans, Balts, and Slavs which follow: they are all branches from the same trunk.

Originally, Celt, German, Balt, and Slav were indistinguishably Nordic. The Celts were the first group to make an impact on the Classical world, and so we will deal with them first. (The “C” may be pronounced either with an “s” sound, the result of French influence, or with a “k” sound. The latter was the original pronunciation.) The reason the Celts interacted with the Greeks and Romans before the other groups did is that their wanderings took them farthest south. The Roman conquest of southeastern Europe, Gaul, and Britain destroyed the greater part of Celtic culture, as well as doing an enormous amount of racial damage.

But the Celts themselves, as much as anyone else, were responsible for the decline of their racial fortunes. They settled in regions of Europe which, although not so heavily Mediterraneanized as Greece and Italy, were much more so than the German, Baltic, and Slavic areas. And, as has so often been the case with the Indo-Europeans, for the most part they did not force the indigenous populations out of the areas they conquered, but made subjects of them instead. Thus, many people who think of themselves as “Celts” today are actually more Mediterranean than Celtic. And others, with Latin, Germanic, or Slavic names, are actually of nearly unmixed Celtic descent. In this chapter we will look at the origins of the Celts and at their interaction with the Romans.

The early Celts were not literate, and we are, therefore, dependent on Classical authors for much of what we know about Celtic mores, lifestyles, and behavior, as well as the physical appearance of the Celts themselves. The fourth-century Byzantine writer, Ammianus Marcellinus, drawing on reports from the first century B.C., tells us that the Celts (or Gauls, as the Romans called them) were fastidious, fair, and fierce:

The Gauls are all exceedingly careful of cleanliness and neatness, nor in all the country could any man or woman, however poor, be seen either dirty or ragged. Nearly all are of a lofty stature, fair and of ruddy complexion: terrible from the sternness of their eyes, very quarrelsome, and of great pride and insolence. A whole troop of foreigners would not be able to withstand a single Gaul if he called his wife to his assistance, who is usually very strong and with blue eyes.

All the Classical writers agree in their descriptions of the Celts as being tall, light-eyed, and with blond or red hair, which they wore long. Flowing, abundant mustaches seem to have been a Celtic national trait. And the favorite national pastime seems to have been fighting. Born to the saddle and bred to arms, the Celts were a warlike race, always ready for a brawl. Excellent horsemen and swordsmen, they were heartily feared by all their enemies.

Perhaps we should not be surprised that these equestrian warriors invented chain-link armor and iron horseshoes and were the first to learn how to make seamless iron tires for wagons and war chariots. But the Celts were also the inventors of soap, which they introduced to the relatively unwashed Greeks and Romans. Their inventive genius also manifested itself in the numerous iron woodworking tools and agricultural implements which they developed. They did not build castles, as such, but depended instead on strategically located hilltops, fortified with earthworks and palisades, as places of retreat in wartime. Gradually these hill forts, or *oppida* (as the Romans called them), gained permanent inhabitants and enough amenities so that they could be considered towns. They became the sites of regular fairs and festivals, and centers of trade as well as defense.

Celtic society, following the customary Indo-European pattern, was hierarchical. At the top was a fighting and hunting aristocracy, always purely Celtic. At the bottom were the small farmers, the servants, and the petty craftsmen. The racial composition of this class varied from purely Celtic to mostly Mediterranean, depending on the region.

Relations between the sexes were open and natural, and—in contrast to the norm for Mediterranean societies—Celtic women were allowed a great deal of freedom. When the wife of Sulpicius Severus, a Romanized fourth-century historian, reproached the wife of a Celtic chieftain for the wanton ways of Celtic women, the Celtic woman replied: “We fulfill the demands of nature in a much better way than do you Roman women: for we consort openly with the best men, whereas you let yourselves be debauched in secret by the vilest.” In fourth-century Rome, of course, virtually all the wealth was in the hands of “the vilest” men: Jews, Syrians, and other Oriental immigrants who dominated commerce and constituted the *nouveaux riches*.

The ancestors of the Celts brought the solar religion of their Indo-European homeland with them to the areas they invaded; three-armed and four-armed swastikas, as solar symbols, are an omnipresent element in Celtic art, as is the four-spoked sun wheel. One of

the most widely revered Celtic gods, Lug (or Lugh), had many of the attributes of the Germanic Wotan, and one of his designations, Longhanded Lug, referred to his role as a solar deity, whose life-giving force reached everywhere. By the time of the Roman conquest, however, many extraneous elements had become inseparably blended into Celtic religion. The druids practiced not only solar rites, but some rather dark and nasty ones of Mediterranean origin as well.

Many later writers have not been as careful as Caesar was and tend to lump all Celtic-speaking populations together as “Gauls,” while sharply distinguishing them from the Germans. As a matter of fact, there was a much greater affinity between the Celts and the Germans, despite the language difference, than there was between the truly Celtic elements among the Gauls and the racially different but Celtic-speaking Mediterranean and Celtiberian elements.

In the British Isles the racial effects of the fifth-century B.C. Celtic invasions varied. In some areas indigenous Nordic populations were reinforced, and in others indigenous Mediterranean or mixed populations diluted the fresh Nordic wave. Around 400 B.C. Celts invaded northern Italy in strength, establishing a permanent presence in the Po valley, between the Alps and the Apennines. They pushed out the resident Etruscans and Ligurians, founded the city of Milan, and began exploring possibilities for further expansion south of the Apennines.

In 390 B.C. a Celtic army under their chieftain Brennus defeated the Roman army and occupied Rome. The Celts were not prepared to stay, however, and upon payment of an enormous ransom in gold by the Romans they withdrew again to northern Italy.

In the following centuries there were repeated clashes between adventurous Celts and the people of the Classical civilizations to the south. In the third century B.C. a Celtic army ravaged Macedonia and struck deep into Greece, while another group of Celts, the Galatae, invaded central Asia Minor. Three centuries later the latter were still in place; they were the Galatians of the New Testament. Celtic bands continued to whip Roman armies, even to the end of the second century B.C., but then Roman military organization and discipline turned the tide. The first century B.C. was a time of unmitigated disaster for the Celts. Caesar’s conquest of Gaul was savage and bloody, with whole tribes, including women and children, being slaughtered by the Romans.

By the autumn of 54 B.C., Caesar had subdued Gaul, having destroyed 800 towns and villages and killed or enslaved more than three million Celts. And behind his armies came a horde of Roman-Jewish merchants and speculators, to batten on what was left of Gallic trade, industry, and agriculture like a swarm of locusts. Hundreds of thousands of blond, blue-eyed Celtic girls were marched south in chains, to be pawed over by greasy, Semitic flesh-merchants in Rome’s slave markets before being shipped out to fill the bordellos of the Levant.

Vercingetorix. Then began one, last, heroic effort by the Celts of Gaul to throw off the yoke of Rome, thereby regaining their honor and their freedom, and—whether consciously or not—reestablishing the superiority of Nordic mankind over the mongrel races of the south. The ancestors of the Romans had themselves established this superiority in centuries past, but by Caesar's time Rome had sunk irretrievably into the quagmire of miscegenation and had become the enemy of the race which founded it.

The rebellion began with an attack by Ambiorix, king of the Celtic tribe of the Eburones, on a Roman fortress on the middle Moselle. It spread rapidly throughout most of northern and central Gaul. The Celts used guerrilla tactics against the Romans, ruthlessly burning their own villages and fields to deny the enemy food and then ambushing his vulnerable supply columns.



For two bloody years the uprising went on. Caesar surpassed his former cruelty and savagery in trying to put it down. When Celtic prisoners were taken, the Romans tortured them hideously before killing them. When the rebel town of Avaricum fell to Caesar's legions, he ordered the massacre of its 40,000 inhabitants.

Meanwhile, a new leader of the Gallic Celts had come to the fore. He was Vercingetorix, king of the Arverni, the tribe which gave its name to France's Auvergne region. His own name meant, in the Celtic tongue, "warrior king," and he was well named.

Vercingetorix came closer than anyone else had to uniting the Celts. He was a charismatic leader, and his successes against the Romans, particularly at Gergovia, the principal town of the Arverni, roused the hopes of other Celtic peoples. Tribe after tribe joined his rebel confederation, and for a while it seemed as if Caesar might be driven from Gaul.

But unity was still too new an experience for the Celts, nor could all their valor make up for their lack of the long experience of iron discipline which the Roman legionaries

enjoyed. Too impetuous, too individualistic, too prone to rush headlong in pursuit of a temporary advantage instead of subjecting themselves always to the cooler-headed direction of their leaders, the Celts soon dissipated their chances of liberating Gaul.

Finally, in the summer of 52 B.C., Caesar's legions penned up Vercingetorix and 80,000 of his followers in the walled town of Alesia, on the upper Teaches of the Seine. Although an army of a quarter-million Celts, from 41 tribes, eventually came to relieve besieged Alesia, Caesar had had time to construct massive defenses for his army. While the encircled Alesians starved, the Celts outside the Roman lines wasted their strength in futile assaults on Caesar's fortifications.

In a valiant, self-sacrificing effort to save his people from being annihilated, Vercingetorix rode out of Alesia, on a late September day, and surrendered himself to Caesar. Caesar sent the Celtic king to Rome in chains, kept him in a dungeon for six years, and then, during the former's triumphal procession of 46 B.C., had him publicly strangled and beheaded in the Forum, to the wild cheers of the city's degraded, mongrel populace.

After the disaster at Alesia, the confederation Vercingetorix had put together crumbled, and Caesar had little trouble in extinguishing the last Celtic resistance in Gaul. He used his tried-and-true methods, which included chopping the hands off all the Celtic prisoners he took after one town, Uxellodunum, commanded by a loyal adjutant of Vercingetorix, surrendered to him.

Decadent Rome did not long enjoy dominion of the Celtic lands, however, because another Indo-European people, the Germans, soon replaced the Latins as the masters of Europe.

*Ancient Germans, Traditions Closest to those of Ancient Indo-Europeans
German Growth, Roman Imperialism Led to Conflict*

The first wave of Battle-Axe People to leave the ancient Nordic heartland in the forests and steppes of southern Russia appeared in the Germanic area of northern Europe even before the Neolithic Revolution had become well established there, prior to 4,000 B.C. It would be incorrect, of course, to refer to these earliest Nordic immigrants as "Germans." All that can be said of them, just as of those immigrants south of them who later gave birth to the Celts, is that they were Indo-Europeans. The process of cultural-ethnic differentiation had not resulted in the fairly clear-cut distinctions which allowed one group of people to be identified as Germans, another as Celts, and a third as Balts until approximately the first half of the first millennium B.C.

By about 2,000 B.C., however, the ancestors of the Germans—call them proto-Germans—were at home in southern Sweden, the Danish peninsula, and the adjacent lands between the Elbe and the Oder. To the east were the proto-Balts, to the west and south the proto-Celts. From this tiny proto-German homeland, about the size of the state of Tennessee, the Germans expanded their dominion during the ensuing 3,000 years over all of Europe, from Iceland to the Urals, ruling over Celts, Balts, Slavs, Latins, and Greeks, as well as the non-Indo-European peoples of the Roman Empire. After that it was Germanic peoples, primarily, who discovered, settled, and conquered North America and who, until the internal decay of the last few decades, wielded effective political power even over the non-White hordes of Asia and Africa.

Seventeen centuries before the Teutonic Order conquered the Baltic lands, German expansion eastward along the southern shore of the Baltic Sea had extended German settlement and rule from the Oder to the Vistula. At the same time, expansion was also taking place toward the west and the south, bringing about mingling—and often conflict—between Germans and Celts. With the Roman conquest of Gaul in the first century B.C., direct conflict between the expanding Germans and still mighty and expanding Rome became inevitable.

Actually the death struggle between Latins and Germans began even before Caesar's subjection of Gaul. Late in the second century two neighboring German tribes, the Cimbrians and the Teutons, left their homes in the Danish peninsula because, they said, of the sinking of much of their low-lying land into the sea. Some 300,000 in number, they headed south, crossing the Tyrolean Alps into northern Italy in 113 B.C., where they asked the Romans for permission either to settle or to cross Roman territory into the Celtic lands to the west. The Roman consul, Papirius Carbo, attempted to halt them, and they defeated his army. The Germans then proceeded westward into Gaul and went as far as Spain, where they raised havoc. Ten years later, however, they returned to northern Italy.

This time they were met by a more competent Roman general, the consul Gaius Marius. In two horrendous battles, in 102 and 101 B.C., Marius virtually exterminated the Teutons and the Cimbrians. So many Teutons were massacred at Aquae Sextiae in 102 that, according to a contemporary Roman historian, their blood so fertilized the earth that the orchards there were especially fruitful for years afterward, and German bones were used to build fences around the vineyards. At Vercelli the Cimbrians met a similar fate the following year; more than 100,000 were slaughtered. When the German women saw their men being defeated, they first slew their children and then killed themselves in order to avoid the shame of slavery.

The annihilation of these two German nations was followed by a few decades in which Italy remained relatively safe from further incursions from the north. The Germans' territory was bounded, roughly, on the east by the Vistula and on the south by the

Danube. In the west the boundary was less definite, and the Germans west of the Rhine came into repeated conflict with Roman armies in Gaul.

Tacitus on the Germans. The Romans were naturally curious about the teeming tribes of fierce, warlike people beyond the Rhine who dared contest their conquest of the lands in northern Gaul, and several Roman writers enumerated them and described their way of life, most notably the historian Gaius Cornelius Tacitus. Writing in a first-century Rome which was thoroughly mongrelized, Tacitus was strongly impressed by the Germans' apparent racial homogeneity:

I concur in opinion with those who deem the Germans never to have intermarried with other nations but to be a pure and unmixed race, stamped with a distinct character. Hence, a family likeness pervades the whole, though their numbers are so great. Their eyes are stern and blue, their hair ruddy, and their bodies large, powerful in sudden exertion, but impatient of toil and not at all capable of sustaining thirst and heat. They are accustomed by their climate to endure cold and hunger.

When the Germans fight, wrote Tacitus, perhaps remembering the example of the Teutons and Cimbrians, "they have within hearing the yells of their women and the cries of their children."

Tradition relates that armies beginning to give way have been rallied by the females, through the earnestness of their supplications, the interposition of their bodies, and the pictures they have drawn of impending slavery, a calamity which these people bear with more impatience for their women than themselves.

If these appeals were not sufficient to elicit honorable behavior from each and every German, Tacitus added, their fellow tribesmen dealt with them severely: "Traitors and deserters are hanged; cowards and those guilty of unnatural practices are suffocated in mud under a hurdle." Subject to the same punishment as cowards and homosexuals were draft dodgers: those who failed to present themselves for military service when summoned.

The education of the German youth stressed not only bravery and skill in arms, but loyalty in the highest degree. Tacitus gives an interesting description of the mutual obligations between a German leader and his companions in arms:

The Germans transact no business, public or private, without being armed, but it is not customary for any person to assume arms until the state has approved his ability to use them. Then, in the midst of the assembly, either one of the chiefs, or the father, or a relative, equips the youth with a shield and a spear. These are to them the manly gown (*toga virilis*); this is the first honor conferred on youth. Before, they are considered as part of a household; afterwards, of the state.

There is a great emulation among the companions as to which shall possess the highest place in the favor of their chief, and among the chiefs as to which shall excel in the number and valor of this companions. It is their dignity and their strength always to be surrounded by a large body of select youth: an ornament in peace, a bulwark in war.

Thus, already in 'Tacitus' time, was the foundation in existence upon which the medieval institutions of chivalry and feudalism would rest. The philosopher Lucius Annaeus Seneca, also writing in the first century, shared 'Tacitus' respect for the Germans' martial qualities: "Who are braver than the Germans? Who more impetuous in the charge? Who fonder of arms, in the use of which they are born and nourished, which are their only care?"

Caesar, Tacitus, and other writers also described other attributes of the Germans and various aspects of their lives: their shrines, like those of the Celts and the Balts, were in sacred groves, open to the sky; their family life (in Roman eyes) was remarkably virtuous, although the German predilection for strong drink and games of chance must have been sorely trying to wives; they were extraordinarily hospitable to strangers and fiercely resentful of any infringements on their own rights and freedoms; each man jealously guarded his honor, and a liar was held in worse repute than a murderer; usury and prostitution were unknown among them.

*Death Struggle Between Germany and Rome Decided Fate of White Race
Hermann Was Savior of Europe & White Race*

Julius Caesar's conquest of all the Celts and Germans west of the Rhine and his punitive raids into the German lands on the other side of the river bought time for the Romans to concentrate their military efforts against the still independent Celts inhabiting the Swiss and Austrian Alps and the lowlands between the Alps and the Danube, from Lake Constance to Vienna. More than three decades of intermittent warfare by Caesar and his successors finally subdued these Celts, and their lands became the Roman provinces of Rhaetia, Noricum, and Pannonia.

By 15 B.C. the Danube had been established as the dividing line between the Roman Empire and the free German lands to the north—or Germania Magna, as the Romans named this territory bounded on the west, the south, and the east by the Rhine, the Danube, and the Vistula, respectively. The conquered German lands west of the Rhine, in Alsace, Luxembourg, Belgium, and the southern Netherlands, were divided into the Roman provinces of Upper and Lower Germany.

In 12 B.C. Emperor Augustus sent his stepson Drusus, who had played a major role in the subjection of the Celts, to the mouth of the Rhine to launch an invasion of Germania Magna. Although initially unsuccessful, Drusus led repeated campaigns against the Germans, and by 9 B.C. had defeated several tribes, most notably the Chatti, and pushed more than 200 miles into Germania Magna, reaching the Elbe.

At this point an aside on the names of the German tribes may be helpful; otherwise we may easily become confused by the proliferation of often-conflicting designations given to the various tribes and groupings of tribes by the Romans, the Germans, and others. Because the ancient Germans were, for most practical purposes, illiterate (the Germans' runes were used for inscriptions but not for writing books), the earliest German tribal names we have are those recorded by the Romans: Batavi, Belgae, Chatti, Chauci, Cherusci, Cimbri, Eburones, Frisii, Gothones, Hermunduri, Langobardi, Marcomanni, Saxones, Suevi, Teutones, etc. It is assumed that in most cases these were reasonable approximations to the actual German names.

In some cases these tribal names assigned by the Romans of Caesar's time have survived in the names of modern nations or provinces: Belgium, Saxony, Lombardy, Gotland, and so on. More often they have not; the great stirring up of the nations of Europe between the latter part of the second century and the middle of the sixth century A.D.—the *Voelkerwanderung*, or wandering of the peoples—profoundly changed the German tribal groupings. Some tribes vanished without a trace; others reappeared as elements in new tribal configurations which combined many of the older tribes. Thus, the Saxons of the eighth century consisted not only of the Saxones known to the Romans, but of many other tribal elements as well. The Franks likewise arose after Caesar's time as a confederation of many German tribes. The Romans referred to all the German tribes collectively as Germani, but this was apparently originally the name of only a single minor tribe, which later lost its independent existence. In similar manner the Romanized Franks of a later day referred to all their German neighbors by the name of a single tribal grouping which arose during the *Voelkerwanderung*, the Alamanni; the French name for any German is still Allemand.

Over the next dozen years the Roman military machine continued to consolidate and expand its conquests in Germania Magna. Most of the independent tribes left were those east of the Elbe. Some, like the Marcomanni, had been forced to leave their ancestral lands in the west and resettle east of the Elbe in order to avoid defeat by the Romans. The Germans were on the defensive everywhere, and they seemed well on the way to suffering the collective fate of the Celts.

They were finally beginning to learn one vital lesson, however: they must either unite in the face of the common enemy or become extinct; the independence of the various tribes was a luxury they could no longer afford. A king of the Marcomanni, Marbod, succeeded in uniting most of the tribes east of the Elbe and organizing a standing draft army of

70,000 infantry and 4,000 cavalry from among them, the first time the Germans had accomplished such a feat.

The imperial representative in the conquered German lands was Publius Quintilius Varus, who was more a lawyer and a politician than a general. As an administrator he was brutal, arbitrary, and rapacious. Overturning all local customs, contemptuous of German tradition and sensibility, Varus applied the same measures against the tribes of Germania Magna which he had used earlier while he was proconsul in the Middle East and which Caesar had employed successfully to break the spirit of the Celts in Gaul. He succeeded instead in transforming the respect Germans had learned for Roman power into a bitter and implacable hatred.

The 19th-century English historian Edward Creasy describes especially well the German reaction to Varus and his army:

Accustomed to govern the depraved and debased natives of Syria, a country where courage in man and virtue in woman had for centuries been unknown, Varus thought that he might gratify his licentious and rapacious passions with equal impunity among the high-minded sons and pure-spirited daughters of Germany. When the general of any army sets the example of outrages of this description, he is soon faithfully imitated by his officers and surpassed by his still more brutal soldiery. The Romans now habitually indulged in those violations of the sanctity of the domestic shrine and those insults upon honor and modesty by which far less gallant spirits than those of our Teutonic ancestors have often been maddened into insurrection.

Hermann the Cherusker. As the latter-day Romans were shortly to learn, the Germans dared a great deal. There came to the fore among the wretched, conquered tribes a German leader cast in the mold of the Celt Vercingetorix. Unlike the case with the latter, however, this new leader's daring brought success. He was Hermann, son of Segimar, king of the Cherusci. The Romans called him Arminius. In Creasy's words:

It was part of the subtle policy of Rome to confer rank and privileges on the youth of the leading families in the nations which she wished to enslave. Among other young German chieftains Arminius and his brother, who were the heads of the noblest house in the tribe of the Cherusci, had been selected as fit objects for the exercise of this insidious system. Roman refinements and dignities succeeded in denationalizing the brother, who assumed the Roman name of Flavius and adhered to Rome throughout all her wars against his country. Arminius remained unbought by honors or wealth, uncorrupted by refinement or luxury. He aspired to and obtained from Roman enmity a higher title than ever could have been given him by Roman favor.

Shortly before 1 A.D. Hermann went to Rome to learn the Roman ways and language. He was seventeen or eighteen years old. He served five years in a Roman legion and became a

Roman citizen, a member of the equites, or knightly class. He was sent by Augustus to aid in the suppression of the rebellion in Pannonia and Dalmatia.

What Hermann learned about the Romans redoubled his hatred of them. Again, Creasy's words on the subject can hardly be bettered:

Vast, however, and admirably organized as the fabric of Roman power appeared on the frontiers and in the provinces, there was rottenness at the core. In Rome's unceasing hostilities with foreign foes and still more in her long series of desolating civil wars, the free middle classes of Italy had almost wholly disappeared. Above the position which they had occupied an oligarchy of wealth had reared itself; beneath that position a degraded mass of poverty and misery was fermenting. Slaves, the chance sweepings of every conquered country, shoals of Africans, Sardinians, Asiatics, Illyrians, and others, made up the bulk of the population of the Italian peninsula. The foulest profligacy of manners was general in all ranks...

With bitter indignation must the German chieftain have beheld all this and contrasted it with the rough worth of his own countrymen: their bravery, their fidelity to their word, their manly independence of spirit, their love of their national free institutions, and their loathing of every pollution and meanness. Above all he must have thought of the domestic virtues which hallowed a German home; of the respect there shown to the female character and of the pure affection by which that respect was repaid. His soul must have burned within him at the contemplation of such a race yielding to these debased Italians.

When he returned to his people at the age of twenty-five, Hermann was given a Roman command under Varus. He immediately set to work organizing a revolution. The most difficult obstacle he had to overcome was neither the Germans' lack of military stores or even a single walled fortress, nor their traditional disunity; it was the opposition from the conservative faction among his own people.

As is always so with conservatives, they preferred immediate prosperity under Roman rule, through the trade opportunities it offered or through advantages bestowed on individual leaders by the Romans, to freedom, honor, and the long-range preservation and promotion of their own stock. One of the most hostile of these Romanized conservatives was Hermann's own father-in-law. Nevertheless, Hermann prevailed over the conservative opposition and won most of the leaders of the Cherusci and the neighboring tribes to his conspiracy.

In the summer of 9 A.D. Varus' army, consisting of five legions, was encamped among the Saxons, west of the Weser in the modern state of North Rhine-Westphalia. Late in the month of September Hermann contrived to have a localized rebellion break out among some tribes to the east, and messengers soon arrived at Varus' camp with news of the insurrection. Varus immediately set out with three of his legions to crush the revolt, giving

Hermann the task of gathering up the Romans' German auxiliary forces and following him.

Hermann sprang his carefully planned trap. Instead of gathering an auxiliary force to support Varus, he sent his agents speeding the revolutionary call to the tribes, far and near. Hermann then set out in pursuit of Varus, catching up with him amid the wild ravines, steep ridges, and tangled undergrowth of the Teutoburger Forest, about 20 miles west of the Weser, near the present town of Detmold. The progress of the Roman army had been severely hampered by the heavy autumn rains and the marshy condition of the ground, and Hermann fell on Varus' legions with a suddenness and fury which sent the Romans reeling.

For nearly three days the battle raged with a ferocity which exacted a heavy toll from both sides. The Germans employed guerrilla tactics, suddenly attacking the floundering Roman columns from an unexpected quarter and then withdrawing into the dense forest before the Romans could group themselves into effective fighting formation, only to attack again from a different quarter. On the third day of battle the exhausted remnants of Varus' army panicked and broke, and the Germans annihilated them. Once more, we will let Creasy tell the story:

The Roman officer who commanded the cavalry, Numonius Vala, rode off with his squadrons in the vain hope of escaping by thus abandoning his comrades. Unable to keep together or force their way across the woods and swamps, the horsemen were overpowered in detail and slaughtered to the last man... Varus, after being severely wounded in a charge of the Germans against his part of the column, committed suicide to avoid falling into the hands of those whom he had exasperated by his oppressions. One of the lieutenant generals of the army fell fighting; the other surrendered to the enemy. But mercy to a fallen foe had never been a Roman virtue, and those among her legions who now laid down their arms in hope of quarter drank deep of the cup of suffering, which Rome had held to the lips of many a brave but unfortunate enemy. The infuriated Germans slaughtered their oppressors with deliberate ferocity, and those prisoners who were not hewn to pieces on the spot were only preserved to perish by a more cruel death in cold blood.

Only a tiny handful of Romans escaped from the Teutoburger Forest to carry the news of the catastrophe back to the Roman forts on the other side of the Rhine. Varus' legions had been the pick of Rome's army, and their destruction broke the back of the Roman imperium east of the Rhine. A furious German populace rose up and exacted a grisly vengeance on Roman judges, Jewish speculators and slave dealers, and the civil servants Augustus had sent to administer the conquered territories. The two Roman legions remaining in Germania Magna were able to extricate themselves to Gaul only after hard fighting and severe losses.

The tidings struck Rome like a thunderclap of doom. The aged Augustus felt his throne tremble. He never fully recovered from the shock, and for months afterward he let his hair and beard grow, and was seen by his courtiers from time to time pounding his head in despair against the palace wall and crying out, “Oh, Varus, Varus, give me back my legions!”

Hermann’s great victory by no means ended the Roman threat to the Germans east of the Rhine, and many more battles were to be fought before Rome finally accepted, in 17 A.D., the Rhine and the Danube as a boundary between Roman and German territory. Clearly, though, that September day in 9 A.D. is a watershed of world history; the battle of the Teutoburger Forest is one of the half-dozen most decisive events in the history of the White race. Had Hermann lost that day to Varus, or had the conservatives among the Germans succeeded in aborting or betraying his revolution, the heart of Germany would have been Romanized. The land of the Angles and the Saxons and the Goths would have been permanently open, as was Rome, to the filth of the Levant: to Oriental customs and religion; to the mercantile spirit which places monetary gain above all else in life; to the swart, curly-haired men who swarmed in the marketplaces of the Mediterranean world, haggling over the interest on a loan or the price of a blond slave girl.



Hermannschlacht memorial

The Nordic spirit, the Faustian spirit, which is the unique possession of that race which burst into Europe from the eastern steppes more than 6,000 years ago; the spirit which carried Greece to the heights and impelled the earliest Romans to impose a new order on the Italian peninsula; the spirit which had eventually succumbed to racial decay in the south and which had been crushed out of the Celts of Gaul and Britain—that spirit would

also have been crushed out of the Germans and replaced by the spirit of the lawyers and the moneychangers.

The fact that that spirit survived in the Germans, that it thrived again in Britain after the Saxon conquest, that it lived in the Vikings who sailed their dragon ships across the Atlantic to the New World five centuries after that, that after another ten centuries it carried our race beyond the bounds of this planet—is due in very large measure to the passion, energy, skill, and courage of Hermann the Cheruscer.

Four hundred years were yet to pass and a great deal more German blood shed before the German ascendancy over Rome became final and irreversible, but the events of 9 A.D. presaged everything which followed. After Hermann's mighty feat the decaying Roman Empire was almost continuously on the defensive rather than the offensive. Although the southwestern corner of Germania Magna, encompassing the headwaters of the Rhine and the Danube (the area which had been abandoned by the Marcomanni prior to the *Hermannschlacht*), was later colonized by Rome; and although Emperor Trajan added the trans-Danubian province of Dacia to Rome's possessions at the beginning of the second century, no really serious program of conquest of German lands was again attempted.

The German unity which Hermann forged did not last long, unfortunately. Although he outmaneuvered his rival Marbod, who was forced to seek Roman protection, Hermann himself lost his life to an assassin a few years later. Traditional intertribal rivalries and jealousies came to the fore again. Just as Roman decadence prevented the Romans from conquering the Germans in the ensuing decades, so did German disunity prevent the reverse.

*Migrating Germans, Invading Huns, Expanding Slavs Destroyed Roman Order
Hun Horde Routed Goths, Burst into Central Europe. Attila Yields to Gothic Valor;
Germans Drive Asiatics from Europe*

The Gothic nation, as was mentioned in the previous chapter, had established itself on the southern shore of the Baltic, around the mouth of the Vistula, before 300 B.C. Prior to that the Goths had lived in southern Sweden.

Like the other Germans of their time, the Goths were tall, sturdily built, and Nordic in coloration, with blue or grey eyes and hair colors ranging from red to almost white. Roman reports describe them as the tallest of the Germans, with especially large hands and feet—perhaps a trait resulting from the local mixture of Indo-European and Cro-Magnon races in Sweden.

Soon they were also the richest of the Germans. In direct contact with the amber-gathering Baltic tribes to the east, the Goths monopolized the amber trade. For centuries Gothic caravans loaded with furs and amber pushed southward to sell their goods in the trading centers of the Roman Empire.

Then, in the third quarter of the second century of the present era, during the reign of Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius, the Goths began a general movement to the southeast. Hundreds of thousands of them, taking their families, their cattle, and all their household goods, marched back toward the ancient Indo-European homeland their ancestors had left thousands of years earlier.

The Goths west of the Dniester—the Visigoths—moved down into the Danubian lands west of the Black Sea, where they inevitably came into conflict with the Romans. They conquered the Roman province of Dacia for themselves, after defeating a Roman army and killing a Roman emperor (Decius) in the year 251.

Toward the end of the third century, during the reign of Diocletian, the Empire was divided into eastern and western halves, for administrative and military purposes. The progressive breakdown of communications led eventually to separate *de facto* powers, one centered in Rome and the other in Byzantium (later renamed Constantinople).

During the first three-quarters of the fourth century, despite occasional raids, a state of relatively peaceful coexistence between Goths and Romans pervaded. Especially in the eastern half of the Empire, diplomacy and bribery were used to hold the Goths at bay. During the reign of Constantine (306-337) 40,000 Goths were recruited into the Roman army, and they thenceforth were the bulwark of the Eastern Empire.

The Huns. It was in the reign of Emperor Valens, in the year 372, that the greatest menace to the White race, both Germans and Romans, since the beginning of recorded history suddenly appeared on the eastern horizon. From the depths of Central Asia a vast horde of brown-skinned, flat-nosed, slant-eyed little horsemen—fast, fierce, hardy, bloodthirsty, and apparently inexhaustible in numbers—came swarming across the steppe around the north end of the Caspian Sea. They were the Huns.

The first to feel their impact were the Alans, living south of the Don between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea. The Hunnic horde utterly crushed the Alans, some of whose remnants retreated southward into the Caucasus Mountains, while others fled westward in confusion, seeking refuge among the Goths. In the Caucasus today traces of the Nordic Alans are found in the Ossetes, whose language is Indo-European and who are taller and lighter than the Caucasian-speaking peoples around them.

Next the Huns fell upon the Ostrogoths and routed them. The aged Ostrogothic king, Hermanric, slew himself in despair, and his successor, Vitimer, was killed in a vain effort to hold back the Brown flood. The Ostrogothic kingdom disintegrated, and its people streamed westward in terror, with the Huns at their heels.

Athanaric, king of the Visigoths, posted himself at the Dniester with a large army, but the Huns crossed the river and defeated him, inflicting great slaughter on his army. Thus, the Visigoths too were forced to retreat westward. Athanaric petitioned Valens for permission for his people to cross the Danube and settle in Roman lands to the south. Valens consented, but he attached very hard conditions, which the Goths, in their desperation, were forced to accept: they were required to surrender all their weapons and to give up their women and children as hostages to the Romans.

The Goths crossed the Danube in 376 and settled in the Roman province of Lower Moesia, which corresponds roughly to modern Bulgaria. There the Romans took shameful advantage of them. Roman-Jewish merchants, in return for grain and other staples, took the hostage children of the Goths as slaves. The Goths secretly rearmed themselves and rose up. For two years they waged a war of revenge, ravaging Thrace, Macedonia, and Thessaly. Finally, on August 9, 378, in the great battle of Hadrianople, the Gothic cavalry, commanded now by Fritigern, annihilated Valens' infantry (most of whom were also Goths), and the emperor himself was killed. This was the worst defeat Rome had suffered since the Goths defeated and killed Decius 127 years earlier, and the battle decisively changed the conduct of future wars. Heretofore, Roman infantry tactics had been considered unbeatable, but Fritigern's Goths had shown what heavy cavalry could do to infantry unprotected by its own cavalry.

The emperor of the eastern half of the Empire who succeeded Valens took a much more conciliatory stance toward the Goths, and they were confirmed in their possession of much of the territory south of the Danube which they had seized between 376 and 378. The Huns, meanwhile, had occupied Gothic Dacia (present-day Romania), as well as all the lands to the east.

The ancient homeland of the Nordic race was now in the hands of non-Whites.

For more than four millennia wave after wave of White warriors had come out of the eastern steppe to conquer and colonize Europe: Achaeans, Dorians, Latins, Celts, Germans, Balts, Slavs, Cimmerians, Scythians, Sarmatians, and uncounted and unnamed peoples before all these. But the Sarmatians were the last; after the Huns drove them and the Goths out, no other White barbarians were to come riding out of the east.

For the next thousand years the eastern steppe which had been the breeding ground of the Nordic race became the invasion route into Europe for periodic waves of non-White hordes from Asia: Huns, Avars, Turks, Magyars, Mongols.

The Huns contented themselves, for the time being, with that portion of Europe between the Carpathians and the Danube, leaving the Romans and the Germans elsewhere to their own devices. Rome, a hollow shell peopled largely by Levantines and ruled in effect by a gaggle of filthy-rich Middle Eastern moneylenders, speculators, and merchants, depended for her continued existence upon cleverness and money rather than real strength. Germans menaced her and Germans defended her, and the Romans concentrated their energies on playing German off against German. The game succeeded in the Eastern Empire, more or less, but not in the Western Empire. A Frank, Arbogast, was the chief adviser—and effective master—of Western Emperor Eugenius in the year 394, having assassinated Eugenius' predecessor. The emperor of the East, Theodosius, sent his Gothic army against Arbogast, and Arbogast called on his fellow Franks for support. The two German armies fought at Aquileia, near modern Venice, and the Goths defeated the Franks.

Two of the leaders of Theodosius' army were Alaric the Bold, a Gothic prince, and Stilicho, a Vandal. After the battle of Aquileia Stilicho, nominally subordinate to Theodosius, became the effective master of the Western Empire. Alaric was chosen king of the Visigoths by his tribe and decided to challenge Stilicho, but as long as Stilicho lived he was able to hold Alaric at bay. The emasculated and Levantinized Romans, unable to face the Germans man to man, bitterly resented their German allies as much as they did their German enemies. This resentment, born of weakness and cowardice, finally got the better of the Romans in 408, and they conspired to have their protector, Stilicho, murdered. Then the Romans in all the Italian cities butchered the wives and children of their German allies—60,000 of them.

This foolish and brutal move sent Stilicho's German soldiers into Alaric's arms, and Italy was then at the Goth's mercy. Alaric's army ravaged large areas of the peninsula for two years in revenge for the massacre of the German families. Alaric demanded a large ransom from the Romans and forced them to release some 40,000 German slaves.

Then, on the night of August 24, 410, Alaric's Goths took Rome and sacked the city. This date marked, for all practical purposes, the end of the capital of the world. Rome had endured for 1,163 years and had ruled for a large portion of that time, but it would never again be a seat of power. For a few more decades the moribund Empire of the West issued its commands from the fortress city of Ravenna, 200 miles north of Rome, until the whole charade was finally ended in 476. The Empire of the East, on the other hand, would last another thousand years.

The Huns, meanwhile, had not long contented themselves with Dacia, but had begun expanding westward again, wreaking such havoc that whole nations uprooted themselves and fled as the Huns advanced. The Vandals, a German people closely related to the Goths; the Alans who had been driven westward from the Transcaucasian steppe; and the

Suebians poured across the Rhine into Gaul in 406, setting still other German nations, such as the Franks, Burgundians, and Alamanni, into motion.

Attila, King of the Huns. The Huns halted their westward push for more than 40 years while they consolidated their hold on all of central and eastern Europe, and on much of northern Europe as well. In 433 they gained a new king, whose name was Attila. In 445, when Attila established his new capital at Buda, in what is now Hungary, the empire of the Huns stretched from the Caspian Sea to the North Sea.

In 451 Attila began moving west again, with the intention of seizing Gaul and then the rest of the Western Empire. His army consisted not only of Huns but also of contingents from all the conquered peoples of Europe: Ostrogoths, Gepids, Rugians, Scirians, Heruls, Thuringians, and others, including Slavs. One contingent was made up of Burgundians, half of whom the Huns had subjugated (and nearly annihilated) in 436. The struggle between the Burgundians and the Huns forms the background for the German heroic epic, the *Nibelungenlied*. Attila's mixed army threw western Europe into a state of terror as it advanced. So great was the devastation wrought on the countryside that Attila was given the nickname "the Scourge of God," and it was said that grass never again grew where his horse had trod. Two armies, one commanded by Aetius, the last of the Western Empire's Roman generals, and the other by Theodoric, King of the Visigoths, rode against Attila. Aetius and Theodoric united their armies south of the Loire, in central Gaul, and compelled Attila to withdraw to the north-east. Attila carefully chose the spot to halt his horde and make his stand. It was in a vast, open, and nearly level expanse of ground in northeastern France between the Marne and the Seine, where his cavalry would have ideal conditions for maneuvering. The region was known as the Catalaunian Plains, after the Catalauni, a Celtic people.

In a furious, day-long battle frightful losses were inflicted on both sides, but the Visigoths, Franks, free Burgundians, and Alans of Aetius and Theodoric had gained a decisive advantage over the Huns and their allies by nightfall. Attila retreated behind his wagons and in despair ordered a huge funeral pyre built for himself. He intended neither to be taken alive by his foes nor to have his corpse fall into their hands. King Theodoric had fallen during the day's fighting, and the command of the Visigothic army had passed to his son, Thorismund. The latter was eager to press his advantage and avenge his father's death by annihilating the Hunnic horde.

The wily Roman Aetius, however, putting the interests of his dying Empire first, persuaded Thorismund to allow Attila to withdraw his horde from Gaul. Aetius was afraid that if Thorismund completely destroyed the power of the Huns, then the Visigoths would again be a menace to the Empire; he preferred that the Huns and the Visigoths keep one another in check.

Attila and his army ravaged the countryside again, as they made their way back to Hungary. The following year they invaded northern Italy and razed the city of Aquileia to the ground; those of its inhabitants who were not killed fled into the nearby marshes, later to found the city of Venice.

But in 453 Attila died. The 60-year-old Hun burst a blood vessel during his wedding-night exertions, following his marriage to a blonde German maiden, Hildico (called Kriemhild in the *Nibelungenlied*). The Huns had already been stripped of their aura of invincibility by Theodoric, and the death of their leader diminished them still further in the eyes of their German vassals. The latter, under the leadership of Ardaric the Gepid, rose up in 454. At the battle of the Nedao River in that year it was strictly German against Hun, and the Germans won a total victory, completely destroying the power of the Huns in Europe.

The vanquished Huns fled eastward, settling finally around the shores of the Sea of Azov in a vastly diminished realm. They left behind them only their name, in Hungary. Unfortunately, they also left some of their genes in those parts of Europe they had overrun. But in eighty years they had turned Europe upside down. Entire regions were depopulated, and the old status quo had vanished.

*Christianity Spreads from Levant to Dying Roman Empire, then to Conquering Germans
Germans 'Aryanize' Christian Myths, but Racially Destructive Ethics Retained*

During the turbulent and eventful fifth century the Germans largely completed their conquest of the West. In the early years of that century German tribesmen, who had been raiding the coast of Roman Britain for many years, began a permanent invasion of the southeastern portion of the island, a development which was eventually to lead to a Germanic Britain.

In 476 Odoacer, an Ostrogothic chieftain who had become a general of Rome's armies, deposed the last Roman emperor and ruled in his own name as king of Italy. Meanwhile the Visigoths were expanding their holdings in Gaul and completing their conquest of Spain, except for the northwestern region already held by their Suebian cousins and an enclave in the Pyrenees occupied by a remnant of the aboriginal Mediterranean inhabitants of the peninsula, the Basques.

And throughout the latter part of the century the Franks, the Alemanni, and the Burgundians were consolidating their own holds on the former Roman province of Gaul, establishing new kingdoms and laying the basis for the new European civilization of the Middle Ages. Everywhere in the West the old, decaying civilization centered on the Mediterranean gave way to the vigorous White barbarians from the North.

Oriental Infection. But the Germans did not make their conquest of the Roman world without becoming infected by some of the diseases which flourished so unwholesomely in Rome during her last days. Foremost among these was an infection which the Romans themselves had caught during the first century, a consequence of their own conquest of the Levant. It had begun as an offshoot of Judaism, had established itself in Jerusalem and a few other spots in the eastern Mediterranean area, and had traveled to Rome with Jewish merchants and speculators, who had long found that city an attractive center of operations.

It eventually became known to the world as Christianity, but for more than two centuries it festered in the sewers and catacombs of Rome, along with dozens of other alien religious sects from the Levant; its first adherents were Rome's slaves, a cosmopolitan lot from all the lands conquered by the Romans. It was a religion designed to appeal to slaves: blessed are the poor, the meek, the wretched, the despised, it told them, for you shall inherit the earth from the strong, the brave, the proud, and the mighty; there will be pie in the sky for all believers, and the rest will suffer eternal torment. It appealed directly to a sense of envy and resentment of the weak against the strong.

By the end of the third century Christianity had become the most popular as well as the most militant of the Oriental sects flourishing among the largely non-Roman inhabitants of the decaying Roman Empire. Even as late as the first years of the fourth century, under Emperor Diocletian, the Roman government was still making efforts to keep the Christians under control, but in 313 a new emperor, Constantine, decided that *if you can't lick 'em, join 'em* and he issued an imperial edict legitimizing Christianity.

Although one of Constantine's successors, Julian, attempted to reverse the continuing Christianization of the Roman Empire a few years later, it was already too late: the Goths, who made up the bulk of Rome's armies by this time, had caught the infection from one of their own slaves, a Christian captive whom they called Wulfila. Wulfila was a tireless and effective missionary, and the Goths were an uprooted and unsettled people, among whom the new religion took hold easily. Wulfila's translation of the Bible into Gothic greatly speeded up the process.

Before the end of the fourth century Christianity had also spread to the Vandals, Burgundians, Lombards, Gepids, and several other German tribes. A little over a century later the powerful nation of the Franks was converted. By the beginning of the second quarter of the sixth century, the only non-Christian Whites left were the Bavarians, Thuringians, Saxons, Frisians, Danes, Swedes, and Norse among the Germans—and virtually all the Balts and Slavs.

One can only understand the rapid spread of Christianity during the fourth and fifth centuries by realizing that, for all practical purposes, it had no opposition. That is, there was no other organized, militant, proselytizing church competing effectively with the Christian church.

The Christians had many individual opponents, of course: among the Romans several of the more responsible and civic-minded emperors, such as Diocletian, as well as what was left of the tradition-minded aristocracy; and among the Germans many farsighted leaders who resisted the imposition of an alien creed on their people and the abandonment of their ancient traditions. Athanaric, the great Gothic chieftain who led his people across the Danube in 376 to save them from the invading Huns, was notable in this regard. Athanaric and the other traditionalists failed to halt the spread of Christianity, because they were only individuals. Although there were pagan priests, the traditional German religion never really had a church associated with it. It consisted of a body of beliefs, tales, and practices passed from generation to generation, but it had no centralized organization like Christianity.

German religion was a folk-religion, which grew organically out of the people and out of the land they occupied. The boundary between a tribe's most ancient historical legends and its religious myths, between its long-dead heroes and chieftains and its gods, was blurred at best. Because German religion belonged to the people and the land, it was not a proselytizing religion; the German attitude was that other peoples and races likewise had their own folk-religions, and it would be unnatural to impose one race's religion on another race.

And because German religion was rooted in the land as well as in the people, it lost some of its viability when the people were uprooted from their land. It is no coincidence that the conversions of the Goths, Vandals, Burgundians, Lombards, Franks, and many other German tribes took place during the *Voelkervwanderung*, a period of strife, disorientation, and misery for many of those involved: a period when whole nations lost not only their ancient homelands but also their very identities.

After the *Voelkervwanderung* ended in the sixth century, the Christianization of the remaining pagan peoples of Europe proceeded much more slowly—and generally by fire and sword rather than by peaceful missionary effort. Whereas the Franks had become Christians more or less painlessly when their king Clovis (Chlodweg) converted for political reasons at the end of the fifth century, it was another 300 years before the Frankish king Charlemagne (Karl the Great) was able to bring about the conversion of his Saxon neighbors, and he accomplished that only by butchering half of them in a series of genocidal wars. Early Christianity, in contrast to German religion, was as utterly intolerant as the Judaism from which it sprang. Even Roman religion, which, as an official state religion, equated religious observance with patriotism, tolerated the existence of other sects, so long as they did not threaten the state. But the early Christians were inspired by a

fanatical hatred of all opposing creeds. Also in contrast to German and Roman religion, Christianity, despite its specifically Jewish roots, claimed to be a universal (i.e., “catholic”) creed, equally applicable to Germans, Romans, Jews, Huns, and Negroes.

The Christians took the Jewish tribal god Yahweh, or Jehovah, and universalized him. Originally he seems to have been a deity associated with one of the dormant volcanoes of the Arabian peninsula, a god so distinctly Semitic that he had a binding business contract (“covenant”) with his followers: if the Jews would remain faithful and obedient to him, he would deliver all the wealth of the non-Jewish peoples of the world into their hands. Observant Jews even today remind themselves of this by fastening *mezuzoth* to the door frames of their homes, wherein the verses from their Torah spelling out the Jews’ side of their larcenous deal with Yahweh are inscribed (Deuteronomy 6:4-9, 11:13-21; Yahweh’s reciprocal obligations are in the verses immediately following). Nevertheless, the early Christian church, armed with an effective organization and a proselytizing fervor, and armored with a supreme contempt for everything non-Christian, was able to supplant Jupiter and Wotan alike with Yahweh.

The Germans, however, recreated the Semitic Yahweh in the image of their own Wotan, even as they accepted the new faith. The entire Christian ritual and doctrine, in fact, were to a large extent “Aryanized” by the Germans to suit their own inner nature and lifestyle. They played down the slave-religion aspects of Christianity (“the meek shall inherit the earth”) and emphasized the aspects which appealed to them (“I come bearing not peace, but a sword”). The incoherence and the multitude of internal inconsistencies of the doctrine made this sort of eclecticism easy. In general, the Germans accepted without difficulty the Christian rituals—especially those which, like Christmas, Easter, and Thanksgiving were deliberately redesigned to correspond to pagan rituals and festivals of long standing—and the myths (parthenogenesis, turning water into wine, curing the blind, resurrection from the dead, etc.), and they ignored the ethics (turn the other cheek, all men are brothers, etc.). A Frank of the seventh or eighth century would tremble in superstitious awe before some fragment of bone or vial of dried blood which the Church had declared a sacred relic with miracle-working powers—but if you smote him on the cheek you would have a fight on your hands, not another cheek turned.

As for the brotherhood of man and equality in the eyes of the Lord, the Germans had no time for such nonsense; when confronted with non-Whites, they instinctively reached for the nearest lethal weapon. They made mincemeat out of the Avars, who were cousins to the Huns, in the seventh century, and the Christianized Franks or Goths of that era would know exactly what to do with a few hundred thousand rioting American Blacks; they would, in fact, positively relish the opportunity to do what needed doing.

It could not have been expected to be otherwise. In the first place, a totally alien religion cannot be imposed on a spiritually healthy people—and the Germans were still essentially healthy, despite the dislocations caused by the *Voelkerwanderung*. Christianity had to be

modified to suit their nature—at least, temporarily. In the second place, the average German did not have to come to grips with the alien moral imperatives of the Sermon on the Mount. All he had to do was learn when to genuflect; wrestling with Holy Writ was exclusively the problem of the clergy.

It was not until the Reformation, in the sixteenth century, that the laity began studying the Bible and thinking seriously about its contents. Even then, however, the tendency was to interpret alien teachings in a way that left them more or less compatible with natural tendencies.

But Christian ethics—the slave morality preached in the Roman catacombs—was like a time bomb ticking away in Europe—a Trojan horse brought inside the fortress, waiting for its season. That season came, and the damage was done. Today Christianity is one of the most active forces working from within to destroy the White race.

From the Christian churches came the notion of “the White man’s burden,” along with the missionaries who saw in every African cannibal or Chinese coolie a soul to be saved, of equal value in the eyes of Jehovah to any White soul. It is entirely a Christian impulse—at least, on the part of the average American voter, if not the government—which sends American food and medical supplies to keep alive swarming millions of Asiatics, Africans, and Latins every time they have a famine, so that they can continue to outbreed Whites.

The otherworldly emphasis on individual salvation, on an individual relationship between Creator and creature which relegates the relationship between individual and race, tribe, and community to insignificance; the inversion of natural values inherent in the exalting of the botched, the unclean, and the poor in spirit in the Sermon on the Mount, the injunction to “resist not evil”—all are prescriptions for racial suicide. Indeed, had a fiendishly clever enemy set out to concoct a set of doctrines intended to lead the White race to its destruction, he could hardly have done better. The “White guilt” syndrome exploited so assiduously by America’s non-White minorities is a product of Christian teachings, as is the perverse reverence for “God’s chosen people” which has paralyzed so many Christians’ wills to resist Jewish depredations.

Not the least of the damage done by the Christianization of Europe was the gradual replacement of White tradition, legend, and imagery by that of the Jews. Instead of specifically Celtic or German or Slavic heroes, the Church’s saints, many of them Levantines, were held up to the young for emulation; instead of the feats of Hermann or Vercingetorix, children were taught of the doings of Moses and David. Europeans’ artistic inspiration was turned away from the depiction of their own rich heritage and used to glorify that of an alien race; Semitic proverbs and figures of speech took precedence over those of Indo-European provenance; Europeans even abandoned the names of their ancestors and began giving Jewish names to their children: Samuel and Sarah, John and Joan, Michael and Mary, Daniel and Deborah.

Despite all these long-term consequences of Christianity, however, the immediate symptoms of the infection which the conquering Germans picked up from the defeated Romans were hardly noticeable; White morals and manners, motivations and behavior remained much as they had been, for they were rooted in the genes—but now they had a new rationale. And it is only fair to note that even today a fairly substantial minority of White men and women who still think of themselves as Christians have not allowed their sounder instincts to be corrupted by doctrines suited to a following of mongrelized slaves. They ignore the Jewish origins of Christianity and justify their instinctive dislike and distrust of Jews with the fact that the Jews, in demanding that Jesus be killed, became a race forever accursed (“His blood be on us and on our children”).

They interpret the divine injunction of brotherhood as applying only to Whites. Like the Franks of the Middle Ages, they believe what suits them and conveniently forget or invent their own interpretation for the rest. Were they the Christian mainstream today, the religion would not be the racial menace that it is. Unfortunately, however, they are not; virtually none are actively affiliated with any of the larger, established Christian churches.

*Iberians, Phoenicians, Celts, Romans, Goths, Jews,
and Moors Gave Spain Racial Diversity
Jews Infest Spain, Betray it to Muslim Invaders
Moors End Gothic Rule, Are Stopped by Franks
White Reconquest of Spain Takes Over 700 Years*

Just as the southeastern-most region of Europe—the lands bordering the Black Sea on the west and north—has been a borderland contested between Whites and non-Whites over the course of most of our recorded history, so also has Europe’s southwesternmost projection, the Iberian peninsula, been a racial battlefield throughout the centuries. Serving as a natural gateway into Europe from Africa, Iberia has repeatedly been used by invaders from the south, and the racial consequences may be seen in Spain and Portugal today, where an exceptionally wide range of racial types is to be found.

Cadiz, Malaga, and Cordoba were all established originally by the Phoenicians, and the name Spain itself is of Phoenician origin.

As early as 600 B.C. the Greeks had also established colonies in Iberia, mainly on the coast of northern Catalonia (the northeastern part of the peninsula), for the same reason as the Phoenicians. The Greeks later expanded southward along the Catalonian coast and down into Valencia.

Around 500 B.C. the first Celts arrived. Only in the northwestern part of Iberia, in Galicia and Asturias, did the Celts remain relatively unmixed.

The Basques have undoubtedly undergone a certain amount of racial admixture with Indo-Europeans over the last 2,500 years, but their speech remains as the sole example of a Mediterranean language still extant on western European soil.

In 480 B.C. the Carthaginians, a Semitic people of Phoenician origin, in response to a plea for help from their Phoenician cousins in Cadiz who were attempting to put down an Iberian insurrection, invaded the peninsula. Once in, the Carthaginians decided to stay and they settled down to a long period of expansion and economic exploitation.

Semitic Beachhead. In 237 B.C., after the First Punic War, in which Rome took Sicily away from Carthage, the Carthaginians made the fateful decision to strengthen their beachhead on European soil. They began a general conquest and colonization of those parts of Iberia not already under their control. During this process the Carthaginian general Hamilcar Barca founded the cities of Cartagena and Barcelona, the latter named for his own family.

Rome regarded the Carthaginian moves in Iberia—in particular, the siege of the Greek colony of Saguntum (modern Sagunto, on the Valencian coast)—as a *casus belli*; thus commenced the Second Punic War. After a long and difficult struggle against the redoubtable Hannibal, Rome crushed Carthage and found herself in possession of a new province: Iberia. Although it then took the Romans 75 years to pacify all the Iberians, Celts, and Celtiberians of the peninsula, it remained Roman for more than five centuries. The Roman imprint on Spanish culture and politics, as well as on the racial destiny of the peninsula was very strong.

The Roman conquest ended the power of the Semitic Carthaginians in Iberia, but on the heels of Rome's legions came another plague of Semites to batten on the rich province: the Jews. In their inimitable fashion they wormed their way into every aspect of the Iberian economy, and it was not long before there was hardly a commercial transaction anywhere in the peninsula in which money did not rub off on some Jew's palm.

So many Jews flocked to Roman Spain, and they multiplied so prodigiously there, that today the Jews of the world still divide themselves into two categories: those descended from the Jews of the Iberian peninsula, who are called Sephardim, and those descended from the Jews who battered on central and eastern Europe instead, who are called Ashkenazim. Spain was for the Jews like New York and Miami Beach rolled into one: a commercial center with great natural resources where they could become filthy rich, and a place in the sun where they could then sit on their accumulated shekels in leisure and comfort.

Euric may be considered the founder of the Gothic Kingdom of Spain. He died in 484. His successors, Visigoths and Ostrogoths, ruled the peninsula for the next 227 years.

By the time of Recared I, who reigned from 585 to 601, Gothic Spain was again renowned for its wealth—and again the Jews found that wealth irresistible. The Goths, however, were not so willing as the Romans had been to allow the Jews to eat up the whole country, and in consequence there was almost continual strife between Goths and Jews, with the latter incessantly scheming, agitating, and whining of “persecution.”

Much to their later regret, the Goths did not deal decisively with their Jewish problem. Instead, they allowed themselves to be convinced by their bishops that a sprinkling of holy water would cure the Jews of their ancestral ways. King Sisibert, around the year 620, forced 80,000 Jews to be baptized, and an even larger number were driven from the kingdom.

Half a century later one of his successors, Wamba, was obliged to take similar measures against the Jews, so troublesome had they again become. In 673 he expelled from the Gothic realm all who would not submit to baptism, while the citizens of several Spanish communities acted on their own initiative and dealt with local Jewish merchants and moneylenders in a more forceful and effective way.

Although King Wamba was a strong ruler, who successfully put down a Basque rebellion and maintained his frontiers against his Frankish neighbors to the north and Arab pirates raiding by sea from the south, prosperity had already begun taking its toll of Gothic vigor. It was Wamba’s immediate predecessor, Recesuinto¹⁰ who, at the insistence of the Church, took the first direct step toward Gothic racial suicide (if we do not count as such Sisibert’s allowing baptized Jews to pass as Gentiles a few years earlier) when he abolished the longstanding ban against intermarriage.

Prior to Recesuinto’s reign, the racial pride of the Goths had remained intact. None but Goths might rule, and Goths might marry none but Goths. The penalty for violation of this ban was quite severe: both partners were burned at the stake. Thus, the blood of the Goths had remained unmixed with that of their Roman, Iberian, and Jewish subjects. Recesuinto allowed Goths to marry baptized Jews and anyone else who claimed Christian beliefs, and the nobility of Spain has since been tainted heavily with the Semitic blood of department-store heiresses, or the equivalent thereof in that pre-department-store era.

The Jews conspired all the more against the Goths, and the successors of Recesuinto and Wamba were obliged to take measures against them on a number of occasions. They failed, however, to rid their kingdom of the pestilence, because they did not apply the same measures against baptized Jews as against their unbaptized brethren. This

¹⁰ Also called Recceswinth. (Note of the Ed.)

shortsightedness finally led to the undoing of the Goths during the reign of Roderic, who took the throne in 709.

While the men of Roderic's race had grown soft and indecisive over the course of the dozen generations which had passed since the time of Adolf, unable finally even to cope with a gaggle of money-hungry Semites in their midst, a new Semitic danger had begun to rise to the south of them.

Fall of Spain. Treason delivered Ceuta into the hands of the Arabs and their allies in 711, and an Arab-Moorish invasion force sailed across the strait and seized a beachhead in Andalusia. Roderic's army fought the invaders in a fierce, three-day battle at Xeres (now Jerez de la Frontera), about thirteen miles inland from Cadiz, under a blazing July sun. The Moors under their Berber general Tariq, won, and the Goths retreated to their cities.

The Gothic cities were well fortified and had withstood Arab raiding parties more than once, but as soon as Tariq's dusky horde appeared outside the walls of each city in 711, the Jews inside, by prearrangement, threw open the gates.

For their part, the Jews were more than ready to trade masters. They had hopes, which were soon realized, that under Arab rule they would be able to regain the wealth, power, and privileged position they had held under the Romans. They bitterly hated the Goths for attempting to assimilate them into the Spanish population and make them work for their daily bread alongside Christian Spaniards.

Before word of the Jews' treachery could be spread and the Goths could separate them—baptized and otherwise—from the general population and neutralize them, the invaders held virtually all the strong-points. Within a few months the greater part of Gothic Spain was in Muslim hands, and only scattered survivors made their way northward across the Pyrenees or into one of two remaining Gothic enclaves. One of these, in the southeast, fell to the Arabs a few years later. Only in the mountains of the north, in Asturias, were the Goths able to hold back the Semitic tide permanently.

The victorious Semites and their mixed-race allies from north Africa did not long remain content with their conquests south of the Pyrenees. In 722 they invaded Gothic Gaul and seized Narbonne, Carcassonne, and several other towns. Ten years later, with an enormous army of Arabs and Moors behind him, the Arab governor of Spain, Abd ar-Rahman (whose name is spelled in various ways by different authors), began a new drive to the north, laying waste Gothic and Frankish areas of Gaul alike. His aim was to add all of Europe to the Muslim realm.

Eudes, also known as Odo, the Gothic count of Aquitaine, tried to hold back the invaders at the Garonne but failed. He then combined his remaining forces with an army of Franks

and German volunteers from across the Rhine, under the leadership of Charles (Karl), count of the Austrasian Franks. The armies of Charles and Abd ar-Rahman met in the rolling champagne country of east-central France, between the towns of Tours and Poitiers, in October 732. The ensuing battle was one of the most momentous in the history of our race. The great historian Edward Gibbon also draws on medieval sources in his description of the battle:

In the six first days of desultory combat, the horsemen and archers of the East maintained their advantage: but in the closer onset of the seventh day the Orientals were oppressed by the strength and stature of the Germans, who, with stout hearts and iron hands, asserted the civil and religious freedom of their posterity. The epithet of Martel, the Hammer, which has been added to the name of Charles, is expressive of his weighty and irresistible strokes... The victory of the Franks was complete and final; Aquitaine was recovered by the arms of Eudes; the Arabs never resumed the conquest of Gaul, and they were soon driven beyond the Pyrenees by Charles Martel and his valiant race.

Though forced to retreat south of the Pyrenees, the Arabs and the other Muslim invaders of Spain remained in the peninsula for nearly 800 years, and the genetic damage they wrought there was great. Islam, like Christianity, makes no distinction of race; all that counts is religion, not blood.

After this the Arabs and Moors were gradually pushed back toward Africa in a series of bloody wars with their neighbors to the north. Not until 1492 was the reconquest of the peninsula finally completed. In that year the unbaptized Jews were expelled *en masse* from the country they had betrayed eight centuries earlier, and the remaining pockets of Moors followed them ten years later. The Inquisition, which had been established in 1478, dealt to a limited extent with the baptized Jews.

*Unending Struggle Between European and Asian in the East
Slavic Lands Repeatedly Overrun by Asian Hordes
Sviatoslav, Viking Ruler, Stamps out Khazar Pest
Mongol Terror Rules Russia for 250 Years*

Today the geographical boundary between Europe and Africa-Asia runs roughly from the Strait of Gibraltar eastward across the Mediterranean to the Aegean Sea, along the eastern and northern shores of the Black Sea, thence along the spine of the Caucasus range to the Caspian Sea, and northward along the Urals to the Arctic Ocean. Somewhat more roughly a racial boundary follows the same course, dividing Whites to the north and west from non-Whites to the south and east.

Throughout history the borderlands on either side of this boundary have been contested between White and non-White, between European and Asian, and the contest has been fiercer, bloodier, crueler, and more unrelenting than any of the wars Europeans have fought among themselves. This is as it should be, considering the vastly greater stakes: when European fought European, the outcome determined which sovereign taxes would be paid to or the language one's descendants would speak, but when European fought Asian the issue was whether or not one's descendants would be White.

The contest actually began long before the dawn of history, nearly 10,000 years ago, when the Mediterraneans of northern Africa and the Middle East began infiltrating Europe during the Neolithic period, Mediterraneanizing the southern coastal regions of the continent.

The second phase began about 6,000 years ago with a European counterattack. The Nordic Indo-Europeans sent wave after wave of conquerors, not only into Mediterraneanized Southern Europe and the Cro-Magnon realm in the North, but also into Asia and northern Africa. This phase lasted roughly 4,000 years and, as we have seen in earlier chapters in this series, had mixed success.

The third phase began about sixteen centuries ago, in the year 372, when the Huns came swarming around the north end of the Caspian Sea into southern Russia, a Brown pestilence from Mongolia.

Europe managed to stem the Brown tide in each case, but only at enormous cost. Huge areas of Europe were overrun by the Huns and their successors: Avars, Bulgars, Khazars, Magyars, Patzinaks, Cumans, Mongols, and Ottomans. Sometimes it was more than a century before the invaders could be expelled, and a great deal of racial mixing took place meanwhile.

Some European territory was lost permanently. Even today a large section of the ancient Indo-European homeland on the western shore of the Caspian Sea remains racially Mongoloid, while pockets of racially mixed population can be found throughout Eastern and Southeastern Europe. In other areas the languages of the invaders have displaced the original European languages, even where most of the Asian genes left behind have been thoroughly diluted.

Will there be a fourth phase in the age-old struggle between Europe and Asia? Without a doubt, although it is difficult to forecast the exact form it will take, or even which side will be on the offensive. Certainly, Central Asia has thoroughly lost the threatening aura it had in the days of Genghis Khan and the Golden Horde, and modern Turkey, wracked by internal problems, does not seem a menace to Europe, except in the stream of immigrant workers it is sending into the Western nations.

On the other hand racial Europe—including both Russia and the United States—is as disunited and as spiritually confused as it has ever been. If it is to regain the initiative in the struggle for possession of the planet, it must first regain a measure of unity, based on racial consciousness, and build new spiritual foundations for itself. The principal purpose of this series is to aid in the building of the necessary racial consciousness. So, let us begin looking again at the details.

Perhaps the greatest tragedy of the Hun invasion was the disaster which befell the Alans. The godlike race of Odin and Frigg, of Thor and Balder, met its Ragnarok.

Although the Alan nation was not annihilated, its Golden Age was over. Some were driven south into mountain strongholds high in the Caucasus, where they maintained a national identity for another five centuries. Others fled westward, and most of these shared the fate of the Vandals in Africa. The rest became vassals of the Huns and were turned against their own race.

Then, in the middle of the sixth century, even before Europe had recovered from the desolation left by the Huns, the next Brown wave struck. Driven westward by intertribal warfare in Central Asia, an amalgamation of Mongol tribes known to Europeans as the Avars invaded the Russian steppe in 560. Conquering the Slavs as they went, they were only halted when they came up against the Franks on the Elbe, in 562.

The Avars virtually annihilated the Gepids, to which nation the noble Ardaric, vanquisher of the Huns, had belonged, and seized the Gepids' territory in Pannonia (modern Hungary), thenceforth centering the Avar empire there. They also dislodged the German Lombards (*Langobarden*, i.e., "long-beards") from their ancestral lands, and the latter then invaded Italy, seizing most of the northern half of the peninsula (568-572) and making Pavia the capital of a new Lombard kingdom.

The Avar strength peaked before 600 and declined quite rapidly thereafter, except in Pannonia. Throughout the first quarter of the seventh century one group of Slavs after another asserted its independence of the Avar rulers, and by 626, in which year an Avar attack on Constantinople was repelled, the Slavs had inherited nearly the whole of the Avar empire outside Pannonia.

In 576 another Brown wave lapped at Europe's eastern frontier, as a Turkish tribe invaded the Caucasus and established a beachhead along the northwestern shore of the Caspian. Compared to the two waves which had preceded them, this was a relatively minor one, but it was to have by far the most lethal consequence for Europe in the long run: the new invaders called themselves Khazars.

The Khazars themselves also underwent a transformation during the eighth century: they adopted Judaism as their religion, and thereafter their national character began to change.

From a warlike, nomadic people interested mainly in raiding and fighting, they became a nation of armed merchants and tax collectors. As the principal power in the region north of the Caucasus, they controlled trade between the Arab power to the south, the Turkish power to the east, the Volga-Bulgar power to the north, the Magyar power to the west, and the Byzantine power to the southwest.

Unfortunately, a substantial portion of the trade controlled by the Khazars was in White slaves, with the Slavs bearing the brunt. So many Slavs, both male and female, were shipped southward and eastward by their Khazar rulers that their very name gave rise to the word “slave.”

Rurik arrived in northern Russia, near Novgorod, in or about the year 856, and his arrival is considered to mark the beginning of Russian national history.

Prince Rurik, ruler of Novgorod, died in 879, and he was succeeded by his kinsman Oleg, a Norwegian by birth, who united the principalities of Novgorod and Kiev and then energetically expanded the territory under Rus rule. Viking Russia rapidly became the principal power in the east.

In 964 Rurik’s grandson Sviatoslav, later acclaimed “the Great,” ascended the throne of Russia. Christian missionaries were beginning to ply their trade in Russia, and Sviatoslav’s mother Olga had allowed herself to be baptized, but this proud Viking lord would have none of it; he insisted on holding to the faith of his Scandinavian forebears.

It is fitting that such a warrior, almost as soon as he took the rule, chose as his first task the elimination of the Khazar pestilence. In 965 he utterly laid waste the Khazar empire (to the accompaniment, no doubt, of loud wails protesting his “anti-Semitism”). It can only be regretted that he did not hunt down and dispatch the last member of the tribe; instead he merely scattered them to the four winds, and their descendants, who make up the bulk of eastern Europe’s Jews, are taking their revenge to this day on the White world.

Back in Central Europe the Magyars, as soon as they had taken possession of Hungary, became the scourge of their German, Slav, and Byzantine neighbors for the next half century, raiding as far afield as Bremen, Orleans, and Constantinople. In 954 a raiding party of close to 100,000 Magyars swept through Bavaria and into Franconia, crossed the Rhine at Worms, and devastated northeastern France. They raped, burned, and butchered their way through Rheims and Chalons into Burgundy, then crossed the Alps into Italy to pillage Lombardy.

Again it was the Germans to the rescue. The following year another Magyar army invaded Bavaria and besieged Augsburg. Otto I, the Saxon king, arrived with an army of only 10,000 men and annihilated the Magyar force, in the battle of the Lechfeld. The Germans

pursued and slew fleeing Magyars for three days following the battle, and the Magyars were never after that a major threat to Europe.

It should be noted here that there was a fair amount of diversity in the various Asian waves which had been impinging on Europe's eastern frontier since the fourth century. All the groups involved spoke languages of the Ural-Altaic group (the Magyars spoke a Uralic language; all the others spoke Altaic); they were all mounted nomads; and they all contained a strong Mongoloid racial element.

It was primarily in this last feature that the diversity was found. Each group passed through a vast expanse of territory in reaching Europe, and this territory was not empty. Although the Sarmatians were the last White group to enter Europe from the east, there were other Whites left in Turkistan—and even further east—who didn't make it to Europe before the first Brown wave from Central Asia washed over them and submerged them.

Some of the Asian invaders traveled quite rapidly through the peoples between their own homelands and Europe, absorbing little if any White blood on the way, while others took centuries to make the passage. Even those who did not linger among White or part-White populations often had absorbed some White genes as a result of the slave trade. From the fourth century through the 15th century there was an enormous traffic in White slaves, with millions of Slavs trudging eastward in slave caravans. Thus, while the Mongols who struck in the 13th century passed like lightning from Mongolia to the eastern border of Europe, their chieftain, Genghis Khan, was described by contemporaries as having green eyes and reddish hair—undoubtedly a consequence of the slave trade. Some Turkish leaders were described as almost White in appearance.

Finally, we must remember that race treason is not a new phenomenon. Conquered Slav, Sarmatian, and German peoples sometimes became military auxiliaries of their Brown conquerors. When Attila was defeated by the Visigoths in 451 at Chalons, his horde consisted not only of Brown Huns but also of a number of White allies from the territories through which he had passed.

The first years of the 13th century saw the rise of the next and most terrible of the Asian menaces. In 1206 a Mongol chieftain, Temujin, succeeded in unifying the numerous, perennially quarreling factions and tribes of Mongolia. He then set out on a career of conquest which has never been equaled. In preparation for this career he changed his name to Genghis Khan, "lord of the earth." Genghis Khan's first raiding parties reached Europe in 1221 and won several victories over the princes of southern Russia. He died in 1227, giving Europe a brief respite which it failed to put to good use. When the Mongol horde appeared on Europe's border again in 1236, a campaign of terror not matched since the days of the Huns was unleashed.

Whole areas of southern Russia were depopulated, and Mongol raiders struck deep into the Balkans, Hungary, northern Russia, Poland, and even Germany. In scenes foreshadowing the winter of 1944-5, hundreds of thousands of terrified refugees fled westward as the Mongols, moving rapidly across frozen rivers in the dead of winter, destroyed everything in their path. In Russia the Mongols even sent squadrons back into cities which had been sacked a few days earlier, in order to hunt down and kill any survivors who might have crept out of their hiding places.

An army of Germans, Poles, and Teutonic Knights, under the command of Duke Henry II of Silesia, attempted to halt the Mongols at Liegnitz, Prussia. In a battle fought there on April 9, 1241, the Europeans were decisively defeated. Just two days later another Mongol column completely destroyed the Hungarian army at the Sajo River, about a hundred miles northeast of Budapest.

These two crushing defeats left Central Europe completely at the mercy of the Mongols, who proceeded to consolidate their hold on Hungary and made plans to invade Italy, Austria, and Germany the following winter. Just after Christmas of 1241 they started westward across the frozen Danube—when suddenly a messenger arrived from Karakorum, 6,000 miles to the east, bearing word that Ogatai, Genghis Khan's successor, had died. The Mongols immediately turned their army around and marched back to the east, never to return.

All of eastern and southern Russia remained under occupation by the Mongol horde, however, and the rest of Russia escaped occupation only by acknowledging itself a vassal state and paying tribute to the Mongols. [...]

The Janissaries. The most effective means which the Ottomans employed in their struggle against White Europe, and the most humiliating to their White adversaries, was their corps of Janissaries. The Janissaries were the Ottomans' elite army and they were entirely White.

During the reign of Emir Orkhan (1326-1359), the Ottoman ruler who first seized European soil, an edict was issued commanding the Emir's White subjects to deliver to him each year exactly a thousand young, male children. These children, who were required to have faces "white and shining," were torn from their mothers' breasts and then raised by the Turks with special care and rigor, trained in arms from a tender age and conditioned to give absolute obedience to their masters. Their military discipline was especially severe, but they were liberally rewarded for courage and proficiency.

The yearly levy of a thousand White children was continued for 300 years, until 1648, and during that period the Janissaries came to be the most efficient and feared corps of warriors in the world. They sustained the Turkish power in Central Europe, while the Mongol power in Eastern Europe withered. Hungary was the unfortunate battleground between Europeans and the Turks and their Janissaries during much of this time, with

ownership of various parts or the whole passing back and forth from one side to the other.

At times the Turks entertained dreams of a general conquest of Europe, and it was not until the failure of their second siege of Vienna in 1683 that they began a slow retreat which lasted almost another two and one-half centuries. Even today Turkey retains a beachhead of several thousand square miles on the European side of the Bosphorus.

The Ottoman Turks were the last of the Asian invaders of Europe, but they were certainly not the least. Their occupation has left as severe a racial imprint on the Balkan peoples—Yugoslavs, Albanians, Greeks, Bulgarians, and Rumanians—as the Mongol occupation did on the Russians.

Nevertheless, there remain today many groups throughout the Balkans which are as White as any group in Western Europe: some are immigrants from the north during recent centuries, while others are the descendants of clans and tribes which jealously guarded the purity of their blood and were able to avoid substantial racial mixture even during the darkest days of Asian occupation.

*Mighty Saga of the Northmen. Ninth and 10th Centuries:
Viking Triumphs in Western Europe
Purest White Heritage Survives in North Atlantic Land
Scarcity, Spirit of Heroism Impelled Vikings. Christianity,
Lack of Northern Solidarity Bring End to Viking Age*

Just as it was the Northmen who, by imposing order on Europe's eastern frontier in the second half of the first millennium, stiffened that frontier and made Russia a White racial bulwark against the non-White hordes of Asia, it was also the Northmen who, in the same era, pushed Europe's western frontier westward across the great, unknown Ocean Sea, opening up new lands for settlement by succeeding generations of our race.

Called many names—Danes, Geats, Norsemen, Rus, Swedes, Varangers—they are best known to us by the name which is also used to characterize both the age in which they flourished and the way of life of many of them: Vikings. Like two great waves of raiders, conquerors, and colonizers before them, the Goths and the Anglo-Saxons, they came from the Nordic heartland: southern Sweden and Norway, the Danish peninsula, the adjoining portion of northern Germany, and the nearby North Sea and Baltic islands.

They are of special interest to us in our endeavor to understand who we are, not so much because most of us have Viking forebears (although a great many people with immediate

roots in Ireland, Scotland, England, and northwestern France, as well as in Scandinavia, do), but because they give us a clearer, more detailed picture of that pure essence of Indo-Europeanism of Whiteness—which is the common heritage of all of us, whether our recent ancestors were Germans, Celts, Balts, or Slavs, than we can obtain from a study of any other European people.

German in language like the Goths and the Anglo-Saxons, the Vikings retained other aspects of Germanic culture which those earlier emigrants from the Nordic heartland had already lost by the dawn of the Viking Age. In particular, the Vikings held to their Indo-European religion and world view longer than any of the other Germanic peoples. They also remained hardier, fiercer in battle, and more venturesome than those who had been softened by the more civilized living to the south.

The Vikings not only serve us as an especially useful epitome of Whiteness at a time when our survival demands a renewal of the best of our old values and strengths, but they also provide us with a clear reminder of the danger inherent in one of our most lethal weaknesses: excessive individualism and lack of racial solidarity. A study of the Vikings acquaints us with both the best and the worst (or, in this age, the least affordable) of the characteristics of our race.

A tenth-century Viking narrative poem, *Rígsthula* (Song of Rig), provides a fanciful account of the origins of the Scandinavian population. In it a traveler named Rig (i.e., “king”) is given lodging at three dwellings. At each he manages to impregnate the woman of the house before he leaves, thereby fathering three sons.

The first woman is old and wrinkled, and she dwells in a hovel. The son she bears for Rig is dark, stooped, and ugly. He is named Thrall, and from him is descended the race of serfs and slaves, the hewers of wood and the carriers of water. The second woman is younger, better looking, better housed, and more industrious. Her son by Rig is a sturdy, light-eyed boy, and is given the name Karl. From Karl is descended the race of free peasants and craftsmen. The third woman is young, tall, blond, and lovely, and the house in which she lives is large and magnificent. She bears Rig a son who is strong and straight of limb, white of skin, fair of hair, light of eyes, and quick of mind. He is named Jarl (Earl), and he quickly learns the magic of the runes and the mastery of weapons. He hunts, rides, fights, and fears no man. From him is descended the race of kings and lords of the earth.

Rig himself is identified with the Norse god Heimdall, the whitest of all the gods and the father of all mankind. *Rígsthula* reminds us of the ancient Aryan religious work, the *Rigveda*, which, more than twenty centuries earlier, also gave a fanciful account of the origins of the races. It is clear that Rig’s descendants via Thrall represent the dark, round-headed element in the Scandinavian population, and that this element was at some time in the past held in a servile status by a largely Nordic ruling class.

Scandinavian mythology may also reflect racial memories of early contacts between Nordic invaders and Cro-Magnon natives, in the numerous references to “frost giants.” In any event, by the dawn of the Viking Age a general mixing had taken place. Thralls may still have been darker, on the average, than the free farmers or the nobility, but one could find Nordic slaves, largely the consequence of the Viking policy of enslaving prisoners of war, and one could also find darker elements among the wealthy and powerful, as evidenced by the names of such leaders as Halfdan the Black (ninth-century king of a Viking realm in southern Norway). By far the dominant racial element among the Vikings, however, was Nordic.

To the north of the Northmen, in Norway, Sweden, and Finland, were the Lapps, a very primitive race which lived a nomadic life and gained its sustenance primarily from the reindeer of the forest and tundra. The sixth-century historians Jordanes and Procopius describe the Lapps as being culturally little above the beasts on which they preyed. Both racially and linguistically the Lapps were closely related to the Finno-Ugric tribes to the east. They were short, predominantly dark (although today some Lapps are blond, apparently having absorbed Nordic genes), broad-nosed, and extremely round-headed. They were certainly partly, and perhaps wholly, responsible for the dark element among the Vikings, although there was little mixing between Vikings and Lapps during the Viking Age, because of their entirely different lifestyles. The mixing must have taken place during the prehistoric period, perhaps shortly after the proto-Germans arrived in Scandinavia and before they had driven the ancestors of the Lapps further north.

The isolation by terrain and climate of many Viking communities did not prevent the Vikings from having a remarkable unity of culture, language, and spirit but it certainly did not encourage political unity. Viking individualism seemed to be inimical to a sense of racial solidarity. While more subjective races to the south were often drawn together by the perceived need for mutual support in the face of a hostile world, Vikings were much more inclined to face the world as individuals. Their loyalty and sense of community seldom extended beyond the fighting band to which they belonged—or, at most, to that limited region of Norway or Denmark or whatever which they considered “home”—and they would as gladly, or almost as gladly, hew down the Vikings of a rival band as a monastery full of trembling priests in some southern land. Within the band, however, the Viking ethos demanded a solidarity as uncompromising as that of the other Germanic peoples of their time.

On the Continent too the ninth century was a period of growing pressure from the north. A Frankish chronicler writes:

The number of ships increases; the endless flood of Vikings never ceases to grow bigger. Everywhere Christ's people are the victims of massacre, burning, and plunder. The Vikings overrun all that lies before them, and none can withstand them. They

seize Bordeaux, Perigueux, Limoges, Angouleme, Toulouse; Angers, Tours, and Orleans are made deserts. Ships past counting voyage up the Seine... Rouen is laid waste, looted, and burned. Paris, Beauvais, Meaux are taken; Melun's stronghold is razed to the ground; Chartres occupied; Evreux and Bayeux looted; and every town invested.

Just as in England and Ireland, however, Vikings who at first came only to seize women and gold later came to seize land as well. This process reached its climax early in the 10th century when a Viking band wrested away from the West Franks a substantial piece of territory in northwestern France, south of the lower Seine. In 911 the Frankish king Charles the Simple, the great-great-grandson of Charlemagne, gave legal sanction to this conquest by recognizing the Viking leader Ganga-Hrolf as his vassal and confirming the latter in the ownership of the land which his band had already seized.

Ganga-Hrolf (i.e., Hrolf the Ganger or Ralph the Walker, so named because he was too large to be carried by any horse), called Rollo by the French, in turn submitted to baptism and settled down to the task of enlarging and consolidating his domain. He was the first Duke of Normandy, as his land came to be known, after its Nor(se)man conquerors.

Purest Cultural Heritage. Iceland—which suffered its last attack by White-slaving pirates as late as the 19th century—and the other Viking islands survived the raids, but Greenland did not.

Today these North Atlantic islands, of which Iceland with its quarter-million inhabitants is the most significant, preserve the Viking cultural heritage in its purest form. The modern Icelandic and Faroese languages are nearly identical to the Old Norse spoken by the Vikings, while English and the other Germanic languages have undergone great changes during the last 1,000 years. In folkways as well, many Viking traits have been preserved in the islands, especially in Iceland and the Faroes. There has even been a return to the Viking religion by some Icelanders in recent years.

Racially, Iceland does not present quite as pure a picture as one might wish, for the ninth-century Viking settlers were not all jarls and karls; they brought their thralls along with them as well. Despite this lapse, their descendants today are biologically closer to the original Viking stock than the population of any other country. This racial quality is reflected not only in the tallest average statute in the White world, but in the highest literacy rate (a hundred per cent) as well. Not only do all Icelanders read and write, but a far higher proportion of them are authors than is true for any other country. And, despite her tiny population, which is able to support only a single university, Iceland is able to boast a larger per capita Nobel Laureate quota than any other nation on earth.

Iceland is outstanding in another respect as well: alone among the White nations of the world it does not bear the curse of non-White minorities; it has no Blacks, no Jews, no Vietnamese, no Mexicans. Iceland has not been invaded for the last 1,000 years, except during the Second World War, when the country was occupied by American troops. The bulk of the foreigners withdrew after the war, and Icelanders insisted that future U.S. troops sent to man the air base which the United States was allowed to maintain on the island include no non-Whites.

The greatest debt that the White race owes to Icelanders is for their preservation of the Norse literary heritage: the Viking sagas. While church officials in other European countries were rounding up and burning all the pre-Christian books they could lay their hands on during the Middle Ages, Icelandic scholars were busy writing down the sagas which still existed only in oral form and transcribing, annotating, and expanding those which had been put into writing earlier. Even where we must use extreme caution in drawing historical data from the sagas, they give us a clear and unambiguous picture of the Viking ethos and the Viking world view, of Viking attitudes, beliefs, feelings and temperament. Fortunately, when it is Norse history we want we have the records of the Vikings' literate Frankish and English cousins to supplement and clarify the semi-legendary material of the sagas. From these records we can also gain a good deal of insight into some of the external forces and circumstances which raised the curtain on the Viking Age in the eighth century and then lowered it in the 11th.

One of the forces was certainly the tide of Christendom which was rising over Europe from the south during the eighth century. The Franks had become Christianized during the sixth century, after their king, Chlodwig (Clovis), accepted baptism, but the Saxons, the immediate neighbors of the Northmen, rejected the alien religion from the Levant and held to their ancestral ways, as did the Northmen themselves, of course.

Genocidal Evangelism. Beginning in 772, a year after he became sole king of the Franks upon the death of his brother Carloman, Karl, later known to the French as Charlemagne, son of Pepin the Short and grandson of Karl the Hammer, waged a thirty-two year campaign of genocidal evangelism against the Saxons. The campaign began with Karl's destruction of the Irminsul, or World Pillar, the Saxon equivalent of the Norse World Ash, Yggdrasil, located in the Saxons' most sacred grove, at Eresburg (on the site of the present Marburg), and it became bloodier, crueler, and more intolerant as it wore on.

In 774, at Quierzy, Karl issued a proclamation that he would kill every Saxon who refused to accept the sweet yoke of Jesus. Henceforth a contingent of Christian priests accompanied the Frankish army on its expeditions against the Saxons, and in every Saxon village those who refused to be baptized by the priests were slaughtered on the spot. Karl's savagery reached a peak in the tenth year of the evangelism: in 782, at Verden on the Aller, with the blessing of the Church, he had 4,500 Saxon nobles beheaded. Twelve

years later, in 794, he introduced a policy under which every third Saxon was uprooted from his land and forced to resettle among Franks or other Christianized tribes. Fairly early in this campaign, in 777, one of the most prominent of the Saxon chieftains, Widukind, took shelter among the Danes and appealed to their king, Sigfred, for assistance against the Franks. Although the Danes were wary of becoming involved in a full-scale war against the formidable Karl, they and the other Northern peoples were put on their guard, and they became increasingly indignant over the Frankish suppression of the Saxons' religion.

Karl's brutal campaign against the Saxons undoubtedly helped raise a certain consciousness in the North of the spiritual and cultural differences which separated Scandinavia from those lands which had fallen under the yoke of the Christian Church.

The internal forces leading to the eruption of the Vikings from their Northern fjords were even stronger than the external ones. Among the former was a very high birthrate specifically among the most active and aggressive of the Northmen, the result of their customary practice of polygyny.

According to the 11th-century German ecclesiastical historian, Adam of Bremen, every Swede of more than average substance kept two or three wives, while the nobility had no limit to the number of women they allowed themselves. For example, Harald Fairhair, the Norwegian warrior who unified Norway in the ninth century and became its first king, had as many as 40 sons by some accounts, at least nine of whom are known to history; and Harald's son Erik Bloodaxe had at least eight sons who grew to manhood.

In the capitalistic South such a practice may have meant only that the cleverest and crookedest paper-shufflers—i.e., the richest men—would have more progeny, on the average, than honest workingmen, but in the hard living North, where every man's mettle was tested almost daily by his environment and by his fellows, it was marvelously eugenic: the strong, the able, and the aggressive had proportionately more children than they would have had in a monogamous society.

Another interesting eugenic contrast between North and South is provided by the Christian practice of clerical celibacy. Although there were many periods during the Middle Ages in which violations were commonplace, as early as the fourth century the Church began insisting on total celibacy for the higher clergy. With the growing incidence of monasticism after the sixth century, a greatly increased portion of the population of Christian Europe was subjected to the rule of celibacy.

In the Middle Ages the clerical life was not, as is often the case today, simply a refuge for those who could succeed at nothing else; it was usually the only route to scholarship—and often the only route to literacy as well—and it attracted many able and intelligent men,

whose genes were then lost to their race. For a thousand years, until the Reformation, there was a selective draining away of Christian Europe's intellectual vitality.

The high birthrate among the most active and energetic elements of the population in the Northern countries led to land-hunger and the drive for external conquests. In the words of 17th-century English statesman and writer Sir William Temple: "Each of these countries was like a mighty hive, which, by the vigor of propagation and health of climate, growing too full of people, threw out some new swarm at certain periods of time that took wing and sought out some new abode, expelling or subduing the old inhabitants and seating themselves in their rooms." This state of affairs also held long before the Viking Age, of course.

In addition to the generalized effects of a high birthrate, two other consequences of polygyny which bore on the rise of viking as a way of life were the large numbers of second, third, fourth, and later sons in the families of Norse landholders—sons left without inheritance and without land, unless they could wrest it away from someone else—and a shortage of women.

The most popular way to solve the latter problem was to go on a raid and carry off women from Ireland, England, or France, although there was also a heavy traffic in Slav slave girls from the Rus realms. The *Hrafnsmal* tells of life in Harald Fairhair's court: "Glorious is their way of life, those warriors who play chess in Harald's court. They are made rich with money and fine swords, with metal of Hunaland and girls from the east."

The political consolidation which began taking place in Scandinavia in the ninth century served as an especially strong impetus to Viking colonizers. As mentioned earlier, the Vikings were extremely individualistic, extremely resentful of any encroachments on their freedom of action. After Harald Fairhair won a great sea victory at Hafsrfjord over the Viking chieftains of western Norway in 872, many of them left Norway with their households and their followers and settled in Iceland and the smaller islands of the North Atlantic rather than submit to Harald's rule.

A century later, political consolidation having been achieved, Scandinavian monarchs began to realize the policy advantages in bringing their people into the same religious camp as their neighbors to the south. The first to take the step was Denmark's Harald Bluetooth, son of King Gorm the Old. In 965, fifteen years after Gorm's death, Harald allowed himself to be baptized, and then he undertook the forcible conversion of the rest of the Danes: a move which did not sit well with many and led to further emigration and turmoil in the North. It also led eventually to Harald's deposition and banishment.

The Last Viking. The coming of Christianity to the Viking world eventually meant the end of that world, but it did not change the Viking ethos immediately, as is evidenced by the

life of a man who was certainly one of the most remarkable of all the Vikings, and the last of the truly great ones: Harald Sigurdsson, who, after he became king of Norway, was also known as Harald Hardraada (Hard Ruler) and Harald the Ruthless.

His deeds are the subject of one of the most fascinating of the Viking sagas (*King Harald's Saga*), which we would be inclined to dismiss as an unusually imaginative work of heroic fiction, were it not solidly confirmed by the historical record.

The Vikings' fighting spirit had been sapped by Christianity, but an even larger factor in their demise was their inability to keep in check their quarrels among themselves, combine their forces against outsiders, and thus match the growing power of kings in more unified lands than their own. Excessive individualism took its final toll.

*Centuries of Colonialism Yield Benefits, Perils
Nearly All Black Slaves Went to Iberian America
Economic Colonialism Is Racial Treason*

With the close of the Viking Age in the latter half of the 11th century, we left the prehistoric period, with all its pagan vigor, behind us in the previous chapter and entered an era described more or less fully by contemporary written accounts.

Our aim here, in accord with the purpose of this entire series, is to select from the wealth of historical material covering the events of the last 900 years that which is especially pertinent to racial developments, rather than to political, religious, economic, artistic, scientific, or other cultural aspects of life—keeping always in mind, of course, that, in the final analysis, race and culture are inseparable.

We have already noted, however briefly, the racial developments in Iberia through the 15th century (chapter 19) and in Eastern Europe through the 17th century (chapter 20). Most of what follows will be concerned with the North and the West of Europe: more specifically, with the people of that region and their expansion over the globe.

* * *

For five centuries after the abandonment of the settlements in North America¹¹, Europe staggered along under the burden of a number of problems: battling Moors, Turks, and

Mongols on its southern and eastern frontiers and often well inside those frontiers; yielding up the last of its spiritual and mental freedom and settling into a straitjacket of superstition and orthodoxy, as the Christian Church tightened its grip on all of Europe; succumbing to the Black Death by the tens of millions, as this dread scourge swept over the land in the 14th century and killed every fourth European. In addition to these problems imported into Europe from Asia, the Europeans were no slouches at generating problems of their own, and territorial and dynastic warfare continued to take their toll throughout the Middle Ages.

By the beginning of the 15th century, however, the indomitable spirit of the White race was clearly making gains on several fronts: material, intellectual, and spiritual. On the first of these, European energy and inventiveness had kept up a slow but steady increase in productivity, both in agriculture and in the crafts, so that, despite the ravages of war and plague, the accumulation of wealth in all social strata had resulted in an average standard of living vastly higher than in any Asian land.

In the fifth decade of the century the German printer Johann Gutenberg of Mainz developed the process of printing with movable, metal type to the point that the mass production of books could be undertaken. For the first time in the life of the race the recording and general dissemination of man's accumulated knowledge to all with the wit and the will to profit by it became a practical matter. And it was only in Europe that this wit and will were manifested. Some of the earlier developments in the printing craft had come from Asia—ink and paper, for example—but the explosion in knowledge resulting from Gutenberg's work was confined almost entirely to our own European ancestors. By the end of the 15th century 1,000 new titles per year were being produced by Europe's book printers. By 1815 the number had climbed to 20,000 per year.

Even on the spiritual front there was progress. The Church, grown soft, corrupt, and overconfident in the centuries since the Saxons and the Vikings had been forced to the baptismal font, was spoiling for an upset by the end of the 15th century. It had laid the basis for its own downfall, and early in the following century its monopoly in matters of the spirit was dealt two lethal blows, first by Martin Luther in Germany (1517), and, a little over a decade later, by King Henry VIII in England. It is one of history's sweetest ironies that Martin Luther was a Saxon and King Henry was the descendant of Norman Vikings.

Amerind Fate and Black Tide. The native Amerinds found by the Spaniards in the West Indies were, like those of the mainland, of Mongoloid derivation, being the descendants of Mongoloid peoples who had begun crossing the Bering Strait from Siberia to North

¹¹ Pierce has in mind the unsuccessful conquest of parts of the American continent by the Vikings, a section omitted in this abridgement. (Note of the Ed.)

America some 12,000 years ago and had then gradually propagated throughout the empty North and South American continents and the adjacent islands.


Since the Spaniards' entire purpose in the New World was economic exploitation, not the propagation of their own race, they did not deliberately liquidate the native population. In some areas, however, that was the inadvertent effect of the Spanish conquest. The Indians were not constitutionally suited to the unremitting slave labor in the gold and silver mines and on the sugar plantations which was forced on them by their new masters, and they died like flies under the Spanish yoke. An enormous toll was also taken by smallpox, a disease endemic among the Europeans but one to which the Amerinds, isolated as they had been for thousands of years, had no natural immunity. It virtually depopulated the Caribbean islands and then wreaked havoc among the mainland Indians. (The Indian revenge was syphilis, a New World disease entirely new to the Europeans—at least, in the new and virulent form in which it existed among the Amerinds.)

Because of the inadequacy of the Indians as a local labor force, the Spaniards almost immediately began importing Negro slaves from West Africa. The latter belong to a race ideally suited to the plantation labor of that era. The Blacks were first used in the West Indies, then on the Brazilian mainland. Approximately a million of them were imported in the period 1550-1650, and by the latter date they had completely replaced the Amerind natives as a slave labor force on the Caribbean islands.

Approximately 150,000 Spaniards and Portuguese had migrated to the New World by the middle of the 17th century, and natural increase had raised their number to about 400,000. They ruled over about 9,000,000 Indians—and a growing population of mestizos (Indian-White mixed breeds), Blacks, mulattos, and Indian-Black mixed breeds. Only on the island of Cuba was there anything approaching a truly White Spanish or Portuguese community.

From the beginning of the 17th century, however, Northern Europeans—English, French, and Dutch—began seriously contesting the Iberians' claims on the New World. By 1650 nearly 50,000 English (and a few thousand French and Dutch) immigrants were settled on Caribbean land wrested away from the Spaniards, and another 50,000 had landed in North America.

In sharp contrast to the Spanish and Portuguese colonists, the great bulk of the Northern Europeans came to the New World not to exploit non-White labor and make money, but to settle and work the land themselves, in all-White communities. Thus, colonialism acquired two quite distinct meanings in the 17th and 18th centuries: a strictly economic meaning, which applied to all the Southern European and some of the Northern European colonies; and a racial meaning, which applied almost exclusively to the colonies of the Northerners.



The tropical climate of the Caribbean did not treat the Northerners as well as it did the Southern Europeans, however, and about half of those who settled there were killed off by fever. After reaching a total of around 100,000 by 1700, most of them moved on to North America. The ones who remained switched to Iberian-style colonialism and began importing Blacks to work Caribbean sugar plantations in much greater numbers than the Spanish and Portuguese had.

During the 18th century nearly three million Black slaves were brought into the Caribbean by the English. Another three million were imported by the Iberians, the great majority of them going to Brazil. This established an overwhelmingly non-White population base for the Central and South American area.

It was only in the 19th century that this bleak racial picture for Latin America began to change, and then only in the southernmost part of the region, the consequence of a large influx of new European immigrants (most of them from Southern Europe) into an area which had previously had a very sparse Amerind population and had not been considered suitable for economic exploitation with Black labor by the early Spanish and Portuguese colonists. Today the only countries in South America which are substantially White are Uruguay (nearly 100 per cent), Argentina (between 80 and 90 per cent), and Chile (approximately 50 per cent).

Of the 9.5 million Negroes imported in the three centuries between 1550 and 1850, 4.25 million went to Brazil and other parts of northern South America, and 4.5 million went to the Caribbean and Central America. Another quarter of a million went to southern South America, and only half a million went to the southernmost colonies of North America.

As mentioned above, most of the Northern Europeans who came to the New World had quite different motives than did the Spanish and Portuguese. Most of the latter came only to make money, and relatively few brought their women with them; from the beginning miscegenation was common in the areas controlled by the Iberians.

The Northerners, on the other hand, came for the land and the opportunity for a new life on a new frontier. They brought their women and their plows with them, and for the most part, they did their own labor. They saw in the Indians no opportunity for economic exploitation, but only a danger to their families. Until missionaries began making Christians of the Indians and taking their side against the Whites, the latter just pushed them aside, took their land, and formed all-White communities of farmers, craftsmen, and tradesmen, as they had in Europe.

Colonization Elsewhere. In Australia the Europeans (nearly all British) encountered an extremely primitive native race—in some features even more primitive than the Negro—numbering around a quarter of a million. Disease and deliberate liquidation by the Europeans had reduced the Australian aborigines to about 60,000 by the beginning of this century. Even today, under protection from the Australian government, they have recovered to only 80,000 and remain largely isolated from the predominantly Northern European population of 13 million.

In New Zealand the non-White native population was less primitive, being of Polynesian stock. The European settlers reduced the number of these Polynesians (Maoris) from an initial 250,000 to about 40,000 at the beginning of this century. Since then a misguided White policy of deliberate coddling has resulted in a population explosion back up to the quarter-million mark. Today, among a White New Zealand population of only three million, the still-expanding Maori minority, mostly urbanized, poses a growing racial threat.

First the Portuguese, then in succession the Spanish, the Dutch, the English, the Danes, the French, and the Austrians attempted to control the trade between Europe and India. In every case the motivation was strictly economic, not racial.

Although the long English experience in India had a profound influence on the national psyche of England, it provided no net benefits to the White race. The soldierly spirit of duty and uncomplaining self-sacrifice in the service of one's kind eventually was perverted into a maudlin sense of obligation to the conquered scum of the earth. It was Kipling who said it best:

Take up the White Man's burden
Send forth the best ye breed
Go, bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives' need;
To wait in heavy harness
On fluttered folk and wild
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half child...
Take up the White Man's burden

And reap his old reward:
The blame of those ye better,
The hate of those ye guard.

When the Indians became restless again after the Second World War, superstition and moral softness kept the English from dealing with them as Robert Clive had. In the end, though colonialism in its day had made some Englishmen very rich, nothing was left except the superstition and the softness. And because of that superstition and softness, it is now the Indians and the other conquered races who are colonizing England without opposition from the English.

The story of southern Africa is different, but equally instructive. Although the Portuguese first found it, they saw no economic opportunities there and did not colonize it.

It was, in the 15th century, an almost empty land, with only a few thousand yellow-skinned Bushmen eking out an existence there by hunting and gathering. The Negroes still had not emerged from their jungles, far to the north. The Dutch established the first settlement in southern Africa in 1652, at the Cape of Good Hope, but its purpose was only to provide a way station for their maritime traffic between Europe and the East Indies. Five years later, however, the first Dutch farmers arrived and established farmsteads in the vicinity of the way station. By 1671 Dutch colonists were expanding from the Cape Colony deep into the interior of southern Africa, driving herds of cattle and horses before them and building farms and villages as they went. Mixed with the Dutch trekkers into the interior were an increasing number of German colonists. In 1688 a group of French Huguenot refugees from the anti-Protestant massacres of the Counter-Reformation arrived. From this group are descended the many South Africans of today bearing French names. Although southern Africa had become a *de facto* racial colony by the beginning of the 18th century, it was still a *de jure* economic colony, under the control of the Dutch East India company. The Company, whose sole interest was profit, saw itself losing control of what had been intended to be only a provisioning facility for its ships on the way to and from the East Indies. Consequently, in 1707 it made the fateful decision to stop providing assistance to European families who wanted to settle in its African colony.

In 1717, guided by the same profit-oriented reasoning, it decided to import Black slaves rather than bring more White craftsmen and artisans into the colony to meet a labor shortage. The consequence of these capitalist policies was that, when the Dutch East India Company finally disappeared from the scene in 1795, a century and a half after the arrival of the first settlers, there were still only 15,000 Whites in southern Africa. Furthermore, they had started down the deadly path of dependence on Black labor, rather than total White self-sufficiency. The loss of homogeneity had far-reaching, negative results, which are still felt today. The final end for the Whites there can be, at most, a matter of two decades away.

The hard lesson taught by the different results of the European colonization of North America, Latin America, Australia, New Zealand, India, and southern Africa is that the only type of colonization with lasting significance is racial colonization; and that racial colonization can succeed only when Whites are willing and able to clear the land of non-White inhabitants and keep it clear.

Jew vs. White: More than 3,000 Years of Conflict
Jewish Religion Holds Jews To Be "Chosen" as Rulers of World
Jewish Leaders Find Hatred Necessary
There Can Be No Peace Between Predator and Prey

The purpose of this series of historical articles is the development of a fuller knowledge and understanding of the White past in its readers, in the hope that these things will in turn lead to a stronger sense of White identity and White solidarity. Other races—Arabs, Mongols, Amerinds, Negroes, and the rest—have come into the story only to the extent that they have interacted with Whites and influenced the White destiny. One can turn to other sources for more information on them.

There is one alien race, however, which has exerted such a strong influence on the White destiny since Roman times—and especially during the past century—and which poses such an overwhelming threat to that destiny today that it deserves special treatment. That race—which in the taxonomic sense is not a true race at all, but rather a racial-national-ethnic entity bound together partly by ties of blood; partly by religion; partly by common traditions, customs, and folkways; and wholly by a common sense of identity and perceived common interests—is, of course, the Jewish race.

In early Neolithic times the ancestors of the Jews shared the Arabian peninsula with their Semitic cousins, the Arabs, and presumably were indistinguishable from them. Desert nomads like the other Semites, they gained their sustenance from their herds of camels, sheep, and goats.

In the first half of the second millennium B.C. the first written references to the Jews appeared, the consequence of their contacts with literate peoples in Egypt and Mesopotamia during their roamings. The reviews were uniformly unfavorable. In a research paper published this year, for example, the noted Egyptologist, Professor Hans Goedicke, chairman of the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Johns Hopkins University, associates an inscription on an Egyptian shrine of the goddess Pakht, dated to the 15th century B.C., with the departure of the Jews of Egypt which is fancifully related in the Old Testament's Book of Exodus. The inscription reads, in part: "And when I allowed the abomination of the gods to depart, the earth swallowed their footsteps."

The Egyptians had reason enough to consider their departing Jewish guests “the abomination of the gods,” if there is any truth in the Biblical description of the Jews’ sojourn in Egypt. In the Book of Genesis the Jewish narrator boastfully tells of his fellow tribesmen’s takeover of the Egyptian economy and virtual enslavement of the Egyptian farmers and working people through the sort of financial chicanery which still seems to be their principal stock in trade today: When Joseph, the son of Israel (Jacob), became “ruler over all the land of Egypt” after gaining a corner on the local commodities market, he invited all his relatives in to “eat the fat of the land.” (Genesis 41-45) But eventually, according to the first chapter of the Book of Exodus, there ascended the throne of Egypt a new pharaoh “who knew not Joseph” and who liberated the country from the grip of the Jewish moneylenders and grain brokers, eventually driving them from Egypt.

So the Egyptians may have been “prejudiced”—but, then, so was everyone else. The great Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus (ca. 55-117 A.D.) wrote: “When the Assyrians, and after them the Medes and Persians, were masters of the Oriental world, the Jews, of all nations then held in subjection, were deemed the most contemptible.” (*Histories*, book 5, chapter 8)

The Jews first came into contact with Whites in the Middle East no later than the 12th century B.C., during the Jewish migration into Philistia (Palestine). The Philistines themselves, an Indo-European people, had invaded the area and conquered the native Canaanites only a few years before the Jews arrived (see the 11th chapter in this series for a narrative of the Philistine-Jewish conflict).

In later centuries the Jews spread beyond Palestine into all the corners of the Mediterranean and Middle Eastern world, in part by simply following their mercantile instincts and in part as a consequence of their misfortunes in war. In the eighth century B.C. they were conquered by the Assyrians, who deported some 27,000 of them, and in the sixth century by the Babylonians, who hauled another batch of them away. It was during these forcible dispersions that the Jews’ view of themselves as a “chosen people,” infinitely superior to their conquerors, first stood them in good stead by helping them maintain their solidarity.

Esther Turns a Trick. The sort of resentment and hostility which the Jews generate among their Gentile hosts by behavior based on the deep-seated belief that the world is their oyster is illustrated well by the Old Testament tale of Esther. Set in the fifth century B.C., it suggests that the Persians of that era had already had their fill of Jewish arrogance and pushiness and wanted badly to get rid of their Semitic guests.

The Jewish response to Persian anti-Semitism was to slip a Jewish prostitute into the palace of the Persian king, concealing her Jewishness until she had used her bedroom

skills to win the king's favor and turn him against his own nobles. The ensuing slaughter of 75,000 Persian noblemen described in the Book of Esther is probably a figment of the Jewish imagination, but it is nevertheless still celebrated with glee and gloating, more than 2,400 years after the event, by Jews around the world in their annual Purim festival.

Unfortunately, later massacres instigated or perpetrated by the Jews against their non-Jewish hosts in response to anti-Semitism were all too real. The great English historian Edward Gibbon describes some of these which took place in the first and second centuries A.D.:

From the reign of Nero (54-68) to that of Antoninus Pius (138-161) the Jews discovered a fierce impatience of the dominion of Rome, which repeatedly broke out in the most furious massacres and insurrections.

Humanity is shocked at the recital of the horrid cruelties which they committed in the cities of Egypt, of Cyprus, and of Cyrene, where they dwelt in treacherous friendship with the unsuspecting natives, and we are tempted to applaud the severe retaliation which was exercised by the arms of the legions against a race of fanatics, whose dire and credulous superstition seemed to render them the implacable enemies not only of the Roman government but of human kind.

In Cyrene they massacred 220,000 Greeks; in Cyprus 240,000, in Egypt a very great multitude. Many of these unhappy victims were sawn asunder, according to a precedent to which David had given the sanction of his example. The victorious Jews devoured the flesh, licked up the blood, and twisted the entrails like a girdle round their bodies. (*History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chapter XVI)

Actually, very little of humanity is shocked at the recital of these Jewish atrocities today, for the simple reason that the carefully laundered “approved” textbooks used in the schools omit any mention of them. Instead, humanity is treated to one television “documentary” after another, from “Holocaust” to “Masada” in which the blameless, long-suffering Jews are “persecuted” by their enemies.

When one looks at all of Jewish history from the time of the Egyptian sojourn to the present, the outstanding feature which emerges is its endless series of cycles, each consisting of a period of increasingly arrogant and blatant depredations by the Jews against their hosts, followed by a period of reaction, in which either the exasperated Gentiles slaughter, drive out, and otherwise “persecute” the Jewish offenders; or the Jews manage to get the drop on their hosts instead and arrange a slaughter of Gentiles; or both.

Dual Existence. Indeed, this feature of Jewish history is not only outstanding, it is essential: without it the Jews would have ceased to exist by Roman times, at the latest. For the Jews are a unique people, the only race which has deliberately chosen a dual mode of national

existence, dispersed among the Gentile nations from which they suck their sustenance and at the same time fiercely loyal to their center in Zion, even during the long periods of their history when Zion was only an idea instead of a sovereign political entity.

Without the diaspora the concrete Zion, i.e., the state of Israel, could not exist; and without the abstract Zion—i.e., the concept of the Jews as a united and exclusive whole, divinely ordained to own and rule the world—the diaspora could not exist.

Israel would not survive a year, were it not for the flow of “reparations” payments from West Germany, the billions of dollars in economic and military aid from the United States, and, most of all, the threat of armed retaliation by the United States against any Arab nation which actually makes a serious effort to dispossess the Jews of their stolen Arab territory.

It is certainly not love for the Jews on the part of the masses of Germans and Americans which maintains this support for Israel. It is instead a combination of two things: first, the enormous financial and political power of the Jews of the United States, the latter exercised primarily through the dominant Jewish position in the controlled news media; and second, the influence of a relatively small but vocal and well-organized minority of Jew-worshipping Christian fundamentalists, who accept at face value the Jews’ claim to be the divinely ordained rulers of the world.

And the diaspora would survive little more than a generation, were it not for the Jewish consciousness, the concept of Zion. It is this alone which keeps the dispersed Jews from becoming assimilated by their Gentile hosts, for the Jewish consciousness inevitably raises a barrier of mutual hatred between Jews and Gentiles.

How can a Jew of the diaspora, who is taught from the cradle that he belongs to a “chosen race,” do other than despise the *goyim* around him, who are not even considered human beings by his religious teachers? How can he do other than hate them for holding back him and his fellow Jews from the world dominion which he believes belongs rightfully to the Jewish nation? And how can Gentiles fail to sense this contempt and hatred and respond in kind?

Action and Reaction. In recapitulation, the dynamic of the interaction between Jew and Gentile is this: as soon as the Jews have infiltrated a Gentile land in sufficient numbers so that their organized efforts can be effective, they begin exploiting and manipulating. The more wealth and power they accumulate, the more brazenly and forcefully they attempt to accumulate still more, justifying themselves all the while with the reminder that Yahweh has promised it all to them anyway.

Any tendency to empathize or identify with their hosts is kept in check by a nonstop recitation of all the past wrongs the Gentile world has done them. Even before anti-Semitism exists in reality, it exists in the Jewish imagination: the Gentiles hate them, they believe, and so they must stick together for self-protection.

Sure enough, before the Jews' solidarity has a chance to erode appreciably, the Gentiles are hating them. The Gentiles react to the Jews mildly at first and then with more and more resentment and energy as the Jewish depredations continue. It is this action-reaction combination, the hatred and counter-hatred, which keeps the Jews from being absorbed into the host nation.

Finally there is an explosion, and the most nimble Jews flee to begin the cycle over again in another Gentile land, while the slow ones remain to suffer the pent-up fury of their outraged hosts. The memory of this explosion is assiduously cultivated by the surviving Jews and becomes one more grudge they bear against the Gentile world. They still remember and celebrate the explosions of the Egyptians, the Persians, the Romans, and two dozen other Gentile peoples over the last thirty-five centuries or so, exaggerating their losses and embellishing the details every time in order to make the memories more poignant, while the Gentiles in each case forget within a generation or two.

These periodic outbursts against the Jews have actually served them doubly well: not only have they been invaluable in maintaining the Jewish consciousness and preventing assimilation, but they have also proved marvelously eugenic by regularly weeding out from the Jewish stock the least fit individuals. Jewish leaders, it should be noted, are thoroughly aware of the details of this dynamic. They fully recognize the necessity of maintaining the barrier of hatred between their own people and the rest of the world, just as they understand the value of an occasional explosion to freshen the hatred when assimilation becomes troublesome.

The blame for the decay of the Roman world has often been placed on the Jews. Indeed, some especially brazen Jewish writers have proudly accepted that blame and have even boasted that Christianity was invented deliberately by zealous Jews to further subvert and weaken the Roman Empire. The truth of the matter, however, is that, so long as Roman society was healthy and the Roman spirit strong and sound, both were immune to Jewish malice and Jewish scheming. It was only after Rome was no longer Roman that the Jews were able to work their evil there. After the old virtues had already been largely abandoned and the blood of the Romans polluted by that of a dozen races, the Jews, of course, did everything to hasten the process of dissolution. They swarmed over decaying Rome like maggots in a putrefying corpse, and from there they began their infiltration of the rest of Europe. Thus, the Jews established themselves in every part of Europe over which Rome claimed dominion, and, wherever they could, they remained after that dominion ended. Except in the Mediterranean provinces and in Rome itself, however, their numbers remained relatively small at first.

Despising farming and all other manual activity, they engaged almost exclusively in trade and finance. Thus, their presence was confined entirely to the towns, and even a relatively large commercial center of ten or fifteen thousand inhabitants might have no more than a few dozen Jews. Even their small numbers did not prevent nearly continuous friction between them and their Gentile neighbors, however. As Europe's population, commerce, industry, and wealth grew during the Middle Ages, so did the numbers of Jews everywhere and with them the inevitable friction.

Everyone has heard of the wholesale expulsions of Jews which occurred in virtually every country of Europe during the Middle Ages: from England in 1290, from Germany in 1298, from France in 1306, from Lithuania in 1395, from Austria in 1421, from Spain in 1492, from Portugal in 1497, and so on. What many do not realize, however, is that the conflict between Jew and Gentile was not confined to these major upheavals on a national scale. Hardly a year passed in which the Jews were not massacred or expelled from some town or province by an exasperated citizenry. The national expulsions merely climaxed in each case a rising popular discontent punctuated by numerous local disturbances.

Bred to Business. In addition to the benefits of racial solidarity, the Jews were probably better businessmen, on the average, than their Gentile competitors. The Jews had been bred to a mercantile life for a hundred generations. The result was that all the business—and all the money—of any nation with a Jewish minority tended to gravitate into the hands of the Jews. The more capital they accumulated, the greater was their advantage, and the easier it was to accumulate still more.

Of course, the Jews were willing to share their wealth with their Gentile hosts—for a price. They would gladly lend money to a peasant, in return for a share of his next crop or a lien on his land; and to a prince, in return for a portion of the spoils of his next war. Eventually, half the citizens of the nation were hopelessly in debt to the Jews.

Such a state of affairs was inherently unstable, and periodic explosions were inevitable. Time after time princes and people alike found that the best way out of an increasingly tight financial squeeze was a general burning of the Jews' books of account—and of the Jews too, if they did not get out of the country fast enough. The antipathy which already existed between Jews and Gentiles because of the Jews' general demeanor made this solution especially attractive, as did the religious intolerance of the times.

One would think that one episode of this sort in any country would be enough for the Jews, and that they would thenceforth stay away from a place where they were so manifestly unwelcome. But they could not. Any country in Europe temporarily without a Jewish minority to soak up the country's money like a sponge had an irresistible attraction

for them. Before the embers of the last general Jew-burning were cool, other Jews were quietly sneaking in to take the place of the ones who had been slaughtered.

The great 19th-century Russian writer Nikolai Gogol embodied this extraordinary Jewish peculiarity in a character in his *Taras Bulba*, the story of a Cossack chieftain. The character, Yankel, is one of a group of Jewish, merchants and their dependents who have attached themselves to the Cossacks' camp. One day the Cossacks rid themselves of the Jewish pests by throwing them all in the Dnieper and drowning them—all except Yankel, who hides beneath a wagon. While the massacre is taking place, Yankel trembles in fear of being discovered. As soon as it is over and things have quieted down again, he creeps from his hiding place. The reader expects that Yankel will then waste no time putting as much distance between himself and the Cossacks as possible. But, no; Yankel instead rushes to set up a stall and begin selling gunpowder and trinkets to the men who have just drowned his kinsmen. His eagerness to resume business seems doubled by the fact that now he has no competitors.

The Jews were often able to ameliorate their situations greatly during the Middle Ages by establishing special relationships with Gentile rulers. They served as financial advisers and tax collectors for the princes of the realm and of the Church, always ready with rich bribes to secure the protection of their patrons when the hard-pressed common folk began agitating against them. They made themselves so useful to some rulers, in fact, that they were favored above Christian subjects in the laws and decrees of those rulers.

The Frankish emperor Charlemagne was one who was notorious for the favors and privileges he bestowed on the Jews, and his successor followed his example.

The medieval Church was at least as much at fault as the royalty in showing favor to the Jews. There were exceptions to the rule, however: several Church leaders heroically stood up for the common people and condemned the Jews for exploiting them. One of these was Agobard, a ninth-century bishop of Lyons. Agobard lost his struggle with Louis, but his efforts had a long-range effect on the conscience of many of his fellow Franks. Despite the enormous financial power of the Jews and the protection their bribes bought them, they were continually overreaching themselves: whenever they were given a little rope, they eventually managed to hang themselves. No matter how much favor kings, emperors, or princes of the Church bestowed on them, the unrest their usury created among the peasants and the Gentile tradesmen forced the rulers to slap them down again and again.

The hatred between Jews and Gentiles was so intense by the 12th century that virtually every European country was obliged to separate the Jews from the rest of the populace. For their own protection the Jews retreated into walled ghettos, where they were safe from the fury of the Gentiles, except in cases of the most extreme unrest. And for the protection of the Gentiles, Jews were obliged to wear distinctive clothing. After the

Church's Lateran Council of 1215, an edict forbade any Jew to venture out of the ghetto without a yellow ring ("Jew badge") sewn on his outer garment, so that every Gentile he met could beware him.

But these measures proved insufficient, for they failed to deal with the fundamental problem: so long as the Jews remained Jews, there could be no peace between them and any other people.

Edward the Great. In England, for example, throughout the 13th century there were outbreaks of civil disorder, as the debt-laden citizens sporadically lashed out at their Jewish oppressors. A prominent Jewish historian, Abram Sachar, in his *A History of the Jews* (Knopf, 1965), tells what happened next:

At last, with the accession of Edward I, came the end. Edward was one of the most popular figures in English history. Tall, fair, amiable, an able soldier, a good administrator, he was the idol of his people. But he was filled with prejudices, and hated foreigners and foreign ways. His *Statute of Judaism*, in 1275, might have been modeled on the restrictive legislation of his contemporary, St. Louis of France. He forbade all usury and closed the most important means of livelihood that remained to the Jews. Farming, commerce, and handicrafts were specifically allowed, but it was exceedingly difficult to pursue those occupations.

Difficult indeed, compared to effortlessly raking in capital gains! Did Edward really expect the Jews in England to abandon their gilded countinghouses and grub about in the soil for cabbages and turnips, or engage in some other backbreaking livelihood like mere *goyim*? God's Chosen People should work for a living?

Edward should have known better. Fifteen years later, having finally reached the conclusion that the Jews were incorrigible, he condemned them as parasites and mischief-makers and ordered them all out of the country. They were not allowed back in until Cromwell's Puritans gained the upper hand 400 years later. Meanwhile, England enjoyed an unprecedented Golden Age of progress and prosperity without a Jew in the land.

Unfortunately, the other monarchs of Europe, who one after another found themselves compelled to follow Edward's example, were not able to provide the same long-term benefits to their countries; in nearly every case the Jews managed to bribe their way back in within a few years.

Middle Ages Were Era of Slow, Ordered Evolution. Eastern Europe Had Different Experience With Jews than West. Reformation Resulted in Increased Judaiz̄ation of Western Europe. Inside the White Citadel, Jews Wreak Havoc on Society. Capitalists, Reds Collaborate Against West

This chapter continues the history of the interaction of the Jews with the European peoples, begun in the previous chapter, and carries it from the Middle Ages into the modern era.

The salient characteristic of the Middle Ages was order. The feudal society of the early Middle Ages (from ca. 700 until ca. 1200) was a highly structured society: not only did every man have his place and every place its man, but the relationship of each man to every other was strictly defined. From the lord of the manor down to the village idiot, every person was bound to others by mutual responsibilities and obligations.

The corporate society which flourished in Western Europe from the mid-12th century until its destruction by the rise of finance capitalism in the 18th century was able to approach the ideal primarily because it was a substantially homogeneous society, and its institutions had developed organically over a very long period of time.

Both in theory and in practice corporatism had its flaws, the principal one being that it gained stability at the expense of innovation: medieval society was extraordinarily conservative, and technical progress came at a somewhat slower pace than it might have in a less-regulated society. On the other hand, a reasonable degree of stability is always a prerequisite for continuing progress, and the medieval compromise may not have been so bad after all.

Insofar as personal freedom was concerned, the socially irresponsible “do your own thing” attitude definitely was not so common as it is today, but neither was there a lack of opportunities for the adventurous element among the population to give expression to its urges. It should be remembered that the most common theme of the folk tales which had their origin in the Middle Ages—exemplified in the Grimm brothers’ collection—was that of the young man setting out alone into the world to make his fortune. Certainly, there was more personal freedom, in practice, in the Middle Ages for the average craftsman than there was in the capitalist period of mass production which followed.

For our purpose here, the essential thing about medieval society was that it was an ordered, structured society, with a population base which was, in each particular region, homogeneous. Thus, it was a society imbued with certain natural defenses against penetration by alien elements. The Jew in medieval Europe had relatively little elbow room. He did not fit into the well established, well ordered scheme of things. He was an

outsider looking into a self-sufficient world which had little use for his peculiar talents. This was the situation for the better part of a millennium, and throughout that long period the foremost goal of the Jew was to destroy the order, to break down the structure, to loosen the bonds which held European society together, and thereby to create an opening for himself.

Order is the Jew's mortal foe. One cannot understand the role of the Jew in modern European history unless one first understands this principle. It explains why the Jew is the eternal Bolshevik: why he is a republican in a monarchist society, a capitalist in a corporate society, a communist in a capitalist society, a liberal "dissident" in a communist society—and, always and everywhere, a cosmopolitan and a race mixer in a homogeneous society. And, in particular, it explains the burning hatred the Jews felt for European institutions during the Middle Ages. It explains why the modern Jewish spokesman, Abram Sachar, in his *A History of the Jews*, frankly admits that the universal attitude of the Jews toward medieval European society was, "Crush the infamous thing!"

Yet, even in the Middle Ages the Jews did not do badly for themselves, and they certainly had little cause for complaint, except when their excesses brought the wrath of their hosts down on their heads. As was pointed out in the previous chapter, the Jews established an early stranglehold on the commerce of Europe, monopolizing especially foreign trade. Their real forte, however, was in two staples of commerce forbidden to most Gentiles in Christian Europe: gold and human flesh. Aristotle's denunciations of usury had influenced the leaders of the Church against moneylending, and the practice was consequently forbidden to Christians on religious grounds—although the ban was not always strictly observed. The field was left almost entirely to the Jews, who, in contrast to the Christians, used their religion as an explicit justification for usury.

Moses, the purported author of this basis for all Jewish business ethics, was speaking from the experience the Jews had already gained in Egypt when he indicated that the ultimate goal of moneylending to the strangers in a land "to which thou goest" was to "possess" the land. When it came to the slave trade, the words of Moses were not just permissive, but imperative: "Both thy male and female slaves, whom thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen [*goyim*] that are round about you; of them shall ye buy male and female slaves..." (Leviticus 25:44-46). It is truly said by the Jews themselves that the Hebrew spirit breathes in every word of the Old Testament!

In Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean area the guild system did not reach the full development that it did in the West and the North of Europe, and Jews in Russia, Poland, Lithuania, and parts of Italy engaged in a few trades besides moneylending and slave dealing: the liquor business, in particular. Jews eventually owned most of the inns of Eastern Europe. They also monopolized the garment industry throughout large areas of the East and the South, and the Jewish tailor, the Jewish rag-picker, and the Jewish used clothes peddler are proverbial figures.

The relatively greater opportunities for exploitation of the Gentiles in the East, not to mention the strong presence of the Khazar-descended Jews there, led to a gradual concentration of Europe's Jews in Poland and Russia during the Middle Ages. By the latter part of the 18th century, half the world's Jews were living in Poland. Their power became so great that many medieval Polish coins, minted during periods when Jews were in charge not only of collecting the taxes, but also of administering the treasury itself, bore inscriptions in Hebrew. The Jews even acquired title to the land on which many Polish and Russian churches stood, and they then charged the Christian peasants admission to their own churches on Sunday mornings.

In the West the Europeans froze the Jews out of the industrial and much of the commercial life of medieval society; in the East the Jews froze the Europeans out. In much of Eastern Europe, Jews became the only mercantile class in a world of peasants and laborers, and they used all their cunning and all the power of their wealth to keep their Gentile hosts down. Reaction inevitably set in the East, however, just as it had in the West. The 17th century was a period of great uprisings against the Jews, a period when such heroes as the great Cossack hetman and Jew-killer, Bohdan Khmelnytsky, flourished.

In the 18th century the rulers themselves were finally obliged to take strong measures against the Jews of the East, so bad had the situation become. Russia's Catherine the Great (1729-96), who had inherited most of Poland's Jews after the partition of the latter country, extended and enforced prohibitions against them which not only limited their economic activity but banned them altogether from large areas.

It is this which goes a long way toward explaining how the Poles, saddled with a communist government consisting almost entirely of Jews after the Second World War, have been able in the last three decades to do what Adolf Hitler could not: namely, make Poland into a country which is virtually Jew-free today. Of more immediate relevance at this point in our story, it is the relatively weaker natural resistance to Jews in the West which suggests why it was relatively easy for the Jews there to take advantage of the breakdown of the medieval order and the dissolution of long-established social structures in order to make new openings for themselves.

The Reformation. Another factor which undoubtedly made the West more susceptible to the Jews was the Reformation, the lasting effects of which were confined largely to Europe's northwestern regions, in fact, to the Germanic-speaking regions: Germany, Scandinavia, England and Scotland, Switzerland. The Church of Rome and its Eastern Orthodox offshoot had always been ambivalent in their attitudes toward the Jews. On the one hand, they fully acknowledged the Jewish roots of Christianity, and Jesus' Jewishness was taken for granted. On the other hand, the Jews had rejected Jesus' doctrine and killed him, saying, "His blood be on us and on our children" (Matthew 27:25), and the medieval

Church was inclined to take them at their word. In addition to the stigma of deicide the Jews also bore the suspicion which naturally fell on heretics of any sort. During the Middle Ages people took Christianity quite seriously, and anyone professing an unorthodox religious belief, whether he actively sought converts or not, was considered a danger to the good order of the community and to the immortal soul of any Christian exposed to him.

What the Protestant reformers did for the Jews was give the Hebrew Scriptures a much more important role in the life of the peoples of Europe than they had enjoyed previously. Among Catholics it was not the Bible but the Church which was important. The clergy read the Bible; the people did not. The people looked to the clergy for spiritual guidance, not to the Bible. Among Protestants that order was reversed. The Bible became an authority unto itself, which could be consulted by any man. Its Jewish characters—Abraham, Moses, Solomon, David, and the rest—became heroic figures, suffused with an aura of sanctity. Their doings and sayings became household bywords.

It is ironic that the father of the Reformation, Martin Luther, who inadvertently helped the Jews fasten their grip on the West, detested them and vigorously warned his Christian followers against them. His book *Von den Jueden und ibren Luegen* (*On the Jews and their Lies*), published in 1543, is a masterpiece. Luther's antipathy to the Jews came after he learned Hebrew and began reading the Talmud. He was shocked and horrified to find that the Hebrew religious writings were dripping with hatred and contempt for all non-Jews. Luther wrote:

Do not their Talmud and rabbis say that it is no sin to kill if a Jew kills a heathen, but it is a sin if he kills a brother in Israel? It is no sin if he does not keep his oath to a heathen. Therefore, to steal and rob, as they do with their usury, from a heathen is a divine service. For they hold that they cannot be too hard on us nor sin against us, because they are the noble blood and circumcised saints. We, however, are cursed *goyim*. And they are the masters of the world and we are their servants, yea, their cattle.

Alas, Luther could not have it both ways. He had already sanctified the Jews by elevating the status of their history, their legends, and their religion to that of Holy Writ. His translation of the Old Testament into German and his dissemination of the Jewish scriptures among his followers vitiated all his later warnings against the Jews. Today the church he founded studiously ignores those warnings.

Luther had recognized the evils in the Christian Church of his day and in the men who ruled the Church. He also recognized the evil in the Jews and the danger they posed to Europe. He had the courage to denounce both the Church and the Jews, and for that the White race will be indebted to him for as long as it endures. The great tragedy of Luther is that he failed to go one step further and to recognize that no religion of Jewish origin is a proper religion for men and women of European race. When he cut himself and the

majority of the Germanic peoples off from Rome, he failed at the same time to cut away all the baggage of Jewish mythology which had been imposed on Europe by Rome. Instead he made of that baggage a greater spiritual burden for his people than it already was.

The consequence was that within a century of Luther's death much of Northern Europe was firmly in the grip of a new superstition as malignant as the old one, and it was one in which the Jews played a much more explicit role. Before, the emphasis had been on the New Testament: that is, on Christianity as a breakaway sect from Judaism, in which the differences between the two religions were stressed. The role models held up to the peoples of Europe were the Church's saints and martyrs, most of whom were non-Jewish. The parables taught to children were often of European origin. Among the Protestants the Old Testament gained a new importance, and with it so did the Hebrew patriarchs as role models, while Israel's folklore became the new source of moral inspiration for Europe. Perhaps nothing so clearly demonstrates the change, and the damage to the European sense of identity which accompanied it, as the sudden enthusiasm for bestowing Hebrew names on Christian children.

The Reformation did more for the Jews than merely sanctifying the Old Testament. It shattered the established order of things and brought chaos in political as well as spiritual affairs—chaos eagerly welcomed by the Jews. Germany was so devastated by a series of bloody religious wars that it took her a century and a half to recover. In some German principalities two-thirds of the population was annihilated during the conflicts between Catholics and Protestants in the period 1618-1648, commonly known as the "Thirty Years War."

Everywhere during the 17th century the Jews took advantage of the turmoil, moving back into countries from which they had been banned (such as England), moving to take over professions from which they had been excluded, insinuating themselves into confidential relationships with influential leaders in literary and political circles, profiting from the sufferings of their hosts and strengthening their hold, burrowing deep into the rubble and wreckage of medieval society so that they could more easily undermine whatever rose in its stead.

The French Revolution. In the following century came Europe's next great cataclysm, which broke down what was left of the old order. It was the French Revolution—and it was the first major political event in Western Europe in which Jews played a significant role, other than as financiers. Even so, public feeling against the Jews was such that they still found it expedient to exercise much of their influence through Gentile front men.

Honore Gabriel Riqueti, Comte de Mirabeau (1749-91), the Revolution's fieriest orator—the spendthrift, renegade son of an aristocrat, disowned by his father and always in need

of a loan—was one of these. Another was the bloodthirsty monster Maximilien Marie Isidore de Robespierre (1758-94), dictator of the Revolutionary Tribunal which kept the guillotine busy and spilled France's best blood into the gutters of Paris while the rabble cheered. Both Mirabeau and Robespierre worked tirelessly for their Jewish patrons, supporting legislation granting new rights and privileges to the Jews of France and denouncing French patriots who opposed the Jewish advances.

It was in the new series of European wars spawned by the Revolution, in which Napoleon Bonaparte (1769-1821) was the leading figure, that the Jews extended the gains they had made in France to much of the rest of Europe. Behind Napoleon's armies, which were kept solvent by Jewish moneylenders, marched a ragtag band of Jews to oversee the pulling down of all barriers against their brethren in each country in which French arms triumphed. Ghettos were abolished, all restrictions on Jewish activities were declared void, and anyone who spoke out against the Jews was in danger of being put before a military firing squad.

Despite the enormous services he performed for the Jews, it is clear from his comments, on many different occasions, that Napoleon personally despised them. "The Jews are a vile people, cowardly and cruel," he said in reference to some of the atrocities committed by Jews during the Reign of Terror.

In a letter of March 6, 1808, to his brother Jerome, Napoleon wrote: "I decided to improve the Jews. But I do not want more of them in my kingdom. Indeed, I have done all to prove my scorn of the vilest nation in the world." And when, in 1807, Napoleon issued decrees limiting the extent to which Jewish moneylenders could prey on the French peasantry, the Jews screamed in rage against him.

But the damage had already been done; Napoleon had pulled down the last of the barriers, and by the time of his disgrace and exile the Jews were solidly entrenched nearly everywhere.

It was those Jews who pushed their way into the professions—into teaching Gentile university students, into writing books for Gentile readers, into composing music for Gentile audiences, into painting pictures and directing films for Gentile viewers, into interpreting and passing judgment on every facet of Gentile culture and society for Gentile newspaper readers—who really got inside the Gentile citadel.

The Second World War: Greatest Watershed of World History. Racial View of Life Governed Germany. War Propaganda Depended on White Provincialism Tide of Western Civilization Turned at Stalingrad. After War U.S. Got Same Dose as Forced on Germans

In recent chapters we have seen the White race expand outward from Europe over the globe, conquering and colonizing; we have traced its interactions with alien races in particular, with the Jews; and we have seen its way of life transformed radically, as the feudalism and then the corporatism of the Middle Ages gave way to new social forms in the modern era. We have also witnessed two major upheavals: the Reformation, followed by the ruinous Thirty Years War; and the French Revolution, followed by the Napoleonic Wars. In both cases White society was badly disrupted, and the race's defenses against its enemies were weakened. As we saw in the last chapter, the Jews were quick to take advantage of this.

Nevertheless, when the 20th century dawned European man was still firmly in control everywhere, and he was on the verge of some of the most magnificent victories of his entire history.

But the same quarter-century also saw White men slaughter one another on an unprecedented scale. Although only the American promoters of the slaughter were so brazen as to openly proclaim that its purpose was to "make the world safe for democracy," that, in fact, was the outcome which the First World War went a long way toward establishing. It was a democratic war, in which finance-capital and the manipulators of the rabble joined hands to finish the job begun 125 years earlier with the storming of the Bastille.

With the politicians cheering them on from a safe distance, sixty-one million White men (plus some four million assorted Japanese, Turks, and Negroes) marched forth to do battle. Nine million of them never marched back. Seven million White civilians also lost their lives, many of them from the starvation caused by a British naval blockade of Germany and her allies which was maintained even after hostilities on the battlefield had ended.

But the cause of democracy was definitely advanced. In the first place, by selectively killing off the brightest and the bravest as never before, the war left a population more susceptible to the type of mass manipulation inherent in democratic rule. And, of course, autocratic rule suffered a major setback, as Kaiser and Tsar met their ends.

In Russia the social and economic ravages of the war provided the necessary preconditions for the success of the Bolshevik Revolution, another giant step forward for

democracy—at least, in the eyes of President Wilson and others of a similar mindset. Addressing the U.S. Congress on April 2, 1917, Wilson said: “Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia?”

Those who, like Wilson, fawned on the Jews also found “wonderful and heartening” the consolidation of democracy in Russia which soon followed, when the triumphant Bolsheviks murdered most of the Russian intelligentsia.

The National Socialist Revolution. Of greater significance ultimately than all these scientific and technological advances¹² was the dawning of a new sense of racial consciousness and racial mission during the second quarter of the century, and the establishment of a new society based on this awakened racial feeling and dedicated to the goal of racial progress. The new society was that built by Adolf Hitler and his followers in National Socialist Germany between 1933 and 1945.

It was a society from which alien racial elements and alien spiritual and cultural influences were progressively excluded. The Jews who had been burrowing into German cultural life since the Napoleonic Wars of the previous century were rooted out of the universities and the government bureaucracy, the newspapers and the cinema, radio broadcasting and book publishing.

The homosexuals who had been parading along Berlin’s main streets in women’s clothing were rounded up and packed off to labor reeducation camps to think things over. Drug dealers and communist activists found themselves facing the executioner’s ax. The mulatto offspring of French-colonial Negro occupation troops and German women, stemming from the postwar period, were sterilized, along with tens of thousands of congenitally defective Germans.

An enormous investment was made in educational and recreational programs: curricula for the schools were redesigned to develop a strong sense of racial identity in each child; young adults were taught to look for the best racial qualities when seeking mates and to think of marriage as a sacred institution for producing the next generation of the race; workers were taken on group outings to different parts of the country in order to broaden their outlooks and augment parochial loyalties with national feelings; pageants, public lectures, folk festivals, fairs, parades, and other activities were used extensively to stimulate an understanding of and an appreciation for their cultural heritage among the people.

¹² Omitted in this abridged edition. (Note of the Ed.)

The differing values of human beings were no longer determined by the amounts of money they were able to accumulate, but by their inherent racial quality and by the social value of their work. Hitler was determined from the beginning that the new Germany would be a state ruled by a definite view of life, and not by politicians chosen either by power brokers in smoke-filled back rooms or by the fickle and easily manipulated masses. The leaders of the state would henceforth be men trained, screened, and selected for that task from their early youth, not those political candidates with the most fetching smiles and convincing lies, as was the rule elsewhere in the West.

The degeneracy and decadence which had characterized the democratic Weimar regime in Germany prior to 1933, with all its prancing homosexuals, self-destructive drug addicts, jaded thrill seekers, musical and artistic nihilists, pandering Jews, Marxist terrorists, and whining self-pitiers, were gone, and in their place was a nation of healthy, enthusiastic, self-reliant, and purposeful Germans. Thus, it was world Jewry which publicly declared war on National Socialist Germany only six months after Hitler took office as chancellor. In his declaration of war (published in the August 7, 1933, issue of *The New York Times*), Jewish leader Samuel Untermyer explicitly noted that he expected the Jews' Christian friends to join them in their "holy war" (his words) against Germany.

And, of course, they did—not just the illiterate fundamentalists from America's Appalachia, who, not knowing any Jews personally, found it easier to believe the Old Testament claim of Jewish "chosenness" than those who lived in closer proximity to the Self Anointed Ones, but also the mainline Christians of America and Britain, the more intelligent of whom recognized in the National Socialist world view a creed antithetical to their own.

In the 1930's and early 1940's the Jews had not yet consolidated their grip on all the news and entertainment media of the English-speaking world. There were no television networks, of course, and there were still many independent newspapers and magazines. A united opposition to Jewish war plans by alert Whites might have won the day. Most Whites, however, were neither alert nor united. Their "leaders," the products of a democratic system, were generally devoid of both character and any sense of responsibility. Only an exceptionally bold, selfless, and responsible few—men like aviation pioneer Charles Lindbergh—spoke out effectively. The Jews, on the other hand, found many prominent and powerful Whites with no scruples against taking their money and following their lead. Still, it was not an easy job to convince millions of White men—the majority of them originally of German origin—to march off to Germany in order to butcher their White cousins, just because the latter had dared raise their hands against the Chosen People.

Note of the Ed.: Pierce explains in the following paragraphs that, although the racial feeling was not dead, the spiritual dimension among Americans was almost completely lacking, and that this was aggravated by a lethal form of American provincialism that became an easy target for Jewish war propaganda, through

which outrageous lies were aired about German plans to invade the country. Then, under the subheading “Racial Suicide,” Pierce adds:

When huge fleets of RAF and USAAF heavy bombers destroyed Hamburg in July and August 1943, killing 70,000 German civilians, the foolish British and Americans imagined that they had struck a great blow against their enemies. They little suspected that their true enemies rejoiced to see them killing so many of their own kind.

And when the raping queues of Mongol soldiers formed in every residential neighborhood of a shattered and defeated Berlin, in front of every house where they found a pretty German girl or woman, there was dancing in the streets of London and New York by throngs of empty-headed Whites who did not even dream that what they had caused to happen to the women of Germany would soon enough begin happening to their own women, on their own streets and in their own homes, and that Jew-instigated “civil rights” laws would render them powerless to defend their womenfolk against growing and ever-bolder swarms of savages from every non-White corner of the earth.

And so it was that when the war was finally over—and to the people pulling the strings that meant when Germany was defeated, for Italy and Japan were wholly secondary concerns—it seemed only natural that many things should begin changing. After all, the people had assented to the destruction of everything for which National Socialist Germany stood.



Should Americans and Britons have given their all to smash racism in Germany, only to tolerate racism in America or in Britain? Should people who had just finished killing millions of Germans, in order to teach them that they did not have the right to exclude Jews from their society, still believe that Mexicans could be excluded from the United States or Pakistanis from Britain?

No, it is quite clear that the era of social turmoil and change which followed the war grew inevitably out of the new attitudes deliberately inculcated in order to make the war possible. And it is clear that the war not only resulted in a vast spread and strengthening of Marxist power, but that it also brought about a significant decline in the moral authority of the White world relative to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The White man had questioned his own right to rule, and so he could hardly expect non-Whites not to ask the same questions. Thus, the dissolution of the British Empire, and the end of European colonialism everywhere, were direct consequences of the changed attitudes accompanying the war.

Finally, just as clearly as the Germans lost the war, so did Britain and the United States. In fact, the loser was the White race: European man, whatever his nationality. It was the greatest, most catastrophic loss the race has yet suffered. Whether the loss will prove to be irreparable and decisive remains to be seen.

The Race's Gravest Crisis Is at Hand. Since the end of the Second World War the situation and the prospects of the White race have plummeted, both morally and materially.

As bad as the moral condition of the race was before the war, it became incalculably worse afterward. Not since the Thirty Years War had White men murdered one another with such religiously motivated ferocity and on such a scale. But this time the superstitions which had been employed to justify all the killing were not so deep-seated as they had been 300 years earlier.

When the bomber-sown fire storms which had incinerated hundreds of thousands of German women and children in Dresden, Hamburg, and a dozen other cities had cooled; when the last mass shooting of prisoners of war by the Americans was over; when the British had finished delivering hundreds of thousands of anti-communist Croats and Cossacks at bayonet point to their communist executioners in Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union; when the roving gangs of rapists in Soviet-occupied Berlin had finally become sated; when the orgies of murder in Paris and Prague and the other capitals of "liberated" Europe had died down; when the war and its immediate, bloody aftermath were over and the White men of America and Britain had an opportunity to survey their handiwork and reflect on it, the first doubts came.

One of those most directly responsible for the catastrophe, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, expressed those doubts more bluntly and succinctly than the rest. As he contemplated Britain's problematic future in a postwar Europe overshadowed by the new grown Soviet colossus during one of his rare moments of sobriety, he blurted out: "We killed the wrong pig." This was the same Churchill who a few months earlier, in a less sober moment, had symbolized his contempt for the defeated Germany by ostentatiously urinating into the Rhine in the presence of a group of newsmen.

Many of the Western leaders who had been involved in the war had no more moral compunction or sense of responsibility for what they had done than did Churchill. Their hue and cry about “German war crimes” was often the most effective way of diverting attention from their own crimes and the crimes of others.

The details of the history of the postwar era varied in Britain, in America, in France, and in the other Western nations, but the general trends were the same everywhere. The following paragraphs refer specifically to the United States, but the conclusions to which they lead apply to the West generally.

Multiracial Pseudo-nation. And then, before anyone could catch his balance and figure out what it meant and where it would lead, the “civil rights” phenomenon burst upon postwar America. What would have been impossible before the war gathered momentum in the late 1940’s and carried all before it in the next two decades. When the smoke began to clear late in the 1960’s, White Americans found that they had bamboozled themselves out of their most precious and fundamental civil right: the right of free association.

No longer could they pick and choose their neighbors, taking reasonable measures to ensure that the racial makeup of the communities in which they lived would not deteriorate; any attempt to do so had become illegal and was punishable with a term of imprisonment in a Federal penitentiary.

No longer could they send their children to schools, supported by their own taxes, which were attended by other children of their own race.

No longer could those of them who were employers hire men and women of their own choosing.

Every place and every social grouping in which the White men and women of America had associated freely with their own kind—residential neighborhoods and workplaces, schools and recreation areas, restaurants and cinemas, military units and municipal police forces—was now open to non-Whites, and the latter were not slow to push their way in.

What had been accomplished in the astonishingly short time of a little over two decades was the transformation of the strongest, richest, and most advanced country on earth from a White nation, in which racial minority groups had been effectively excluded from any significant participation in White society except as laborers, to a multiracial pseudo-nation, in which non-Whites not only participated but were a privileged and pampered elite.

The magnitude of the transformation is not apparent to many Whites who were born after it began, but it can be comprehended easily enough by surveying the cultural records of the earlier era. A comparison of magazine advertisements or photographed street scenes, of popular fiction or elementary school textbooks, of motion pictures or faces in high school yearbooks from 1940 with those of the last decade tells the story in stark terms. Not only was this radical dispossession of White Americans carried out in the name of “justice” and “freedom,” but hardly a shot was fired in the process: all together no more than a dozen Whites fell in the weak and utterly ineffectual resistance mounted against it. More than anything else, this lack of resistance indicates the moral state of the race in the postwar era.

It is true, of course that the Jews, who planned and played a large part in directing the dispossession, had prepared well. A few years prior to the war there were still major segments of the American news and entertainment media in the hands of racially conscious Whites. Major publishers in the 1920's and 1930's published books dealing frankly with eugenics, with racial differences, and with the Jewish problem. America's foremost industrialist, Henry Ford, for a while in the 1920's was presenting purchasers of his automobiles with complimentary copies of *The International Jew*, a strongly anti-Jewish book which had earlier been serialized in his newspaper, *The Dearborn Independent*. In the 1930's Father Charles Coughlan, an independent-minded Catholic priest with a radio program which was heard by millions, spoke out strongly against Jewish political scheming, until he was silenced by an order from the Vatican. But by the war's end the Jews had fastened their grip so tightly on the media that dissent against their policies was denied any large-scale public hearing. No major newspaper, motion picture company, radio broadcasting network, or popular magazine was left in the hands of their opponents.

Some institutions, most notably the Christian churches, already contained in themselves the seeds of racial destruction and required relatively little effort to be brought into alignment with Jewish schemes. Others (the Ford Foundation is a striking example) were infiltrated, taken over, and turned in a direction diametrically opposite to that intended by their founders.

Profound Moral Illness. In the final analysis, however, none of these things changes the fact of profound moral illness on the part of the White populations of the Western nations in the postwar era. It is an illness with roots deep in the past, as has been pointed out in earlier chapters, but in postwar America it bloomed.

It is difficult to analyze the witches' brew and place exactly the proper amount of blame on each ingredient. There was the trend toward an ever more vulgar and dishonest democracy, which began well before the war and reached a new depth with the advent of Franklin Roosevelt on the national political stage in 1932.

There were the loss of rootedness and the concomitant increase in alienation stemming from the greater mobility of a motorized population. There was the powerful new propaganda medium of television, with its frightening ability to mesmerize and manipulate.

But it was the unspeakably atrocious crime of the war itself and its effect on those who participated in it which served as the catalyst, causing all the elements to react with one another, and the disease itself to metastasize.

The evil spirit of the immediate postwar period was, at the time, apparent only to an especially sensitive few, while most could not see beneath the superficial glitter of change and motion. The present threat to the survival of the White race is physical as well as moral: while the numerical balance of the races is shifting rapidly from White to non-White, both in the world as a whole and in most of the formerly White nations of the northern hemisphere, the average racial quality of those in the White camp is declining.

The world racial balance has shifted from 30 per cent White in 1900 to just under 20 per cent White in 1982. By the end of the next decade the world will be less than 16 per cent White. The population explosion in the southern hemisphere which is responsible for this racial shift is largely the consequence of the export of White science and technology, which have dramatically reduced death rates in Africa, India, and other non-White areas of the world.

Postwar racial mixing has been accompanied by an enormous increase in miscegenation. Prior to the war, marriage between Whites and Blacks in the United States was nowhere socially acceptable, and it was illegal in many states. The few mulatto offspring produced were nearly always born to Black mothers and remained in the Black racial community. After the war an unrelenting propaganda brought down all legal and most social barriers to miscegenation, and the second generation of mixed-race offspring is now approaching breeding age.

Grim Recapitulation. To recapitulate the present situation of the White race: White geographical expansion, which was the rule for the last four centuries, has not only been halted in the 20th century, with the end of European colonialism, but it has been reversed in the period since the Second World War.

There are now more than four non-Whites for every White living on the planet, and the ratio is shifting toward an even greater non-White preponderance at an accelerating rate.

The prognosis is grave. If the present demographic trends continue unabated for another half-century, and if no sustained effort to ensure an alternative outcome is made during that time by a determined and farsighted minority of people of European ancestry, then

the race whose history we have traced in these twenty-six chapters will have reached the end of its long journey. It may linger another century or more in isolated enclaves, such as Iceland, and its characteristic features or coloring will recur with diminishing frequency in individuals for the next millennium, but before the middle of the 21st century it will have reached its point of no return.

Then, gradually or quickly, the race which built the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome, which conquered the earth and established its dominion over every other race, which unlocked the secret of the atom and harnessed the power which lights the sun, and which freed itself from the grasp of gravity and reached out to new worlds will vanish into the eternal darkness. And the present demographic trends will continue so long as the political, religious, and social concepts and values which presently circumscribe the thinking of the Western peoples and their leaders continue to have a determining role. For at root it is a moral defect which threatens the race's survival.

If the will to survive existed among the White masses, and if they were willing to take the necessary measures—which would require that they act contrary to the dictates of the religion—, then the physical threat could be overcome, certainly and quickly. Non-White immigration could be halted immediately, with relatively little effort. Undoing the effects of earlier non-White immigration and of miscegenation would be a much larger task, involving major economic readjustments and undoubtedly a substantial amount of bloodshed as well, but it would be a task well within the physical capabilities of the White majority.

These things could be accomplished, even at this late date. And once accomplished in one major country, they could be extended worldwide, though perhaps not without another major war and its attendant risks. But, of course, they will not be accomplished, because the will to survive does not exist, and has not existed in the White population of any major power since the end of the Second World War. The race's last chance to overcome its problems in this relatively painless manner died in January 1943, at Stalingrad.

So, much will inevitably be lost during the next few decades. The population balance everywhere will shift even more rapidly toward the non-Whites, the mongrels, and the unfit. The world will become a poorer, uglier, noisier, more crowded, and dirtier place. Superstition, degeneracy, and corruption will be pervasive, even among those Whites of sound racial stock, and much of the best stock will disappear forever through racial mixing.

And repression will certainly increase everywhere: those who stand for quality over quantity and for racial progress will be denied the right of dissent and the right of self-defense, in the name of “freedom” and “justice.”

Ultimately, however, none of these losses need be decisive or even significant, frightening though they may be to contemplate now, and terrible though they may be to experience in the dark years immediately ahead. All that is really important is that a portion of the race survive, keep itself pure physically and spiritually, continue propagating itself, and eventually prevail over those who threaten its existence, even if this take a thousand years; and to ensure this outcome is the urgent task of the racially conscious minority of our people in these perilous times.

A Few Guidelines. A detailed elaboration of this task here would take us beyond the intended scope of this series, which, as stated in the prologue to the first chapter, has been merely to provide for its readers a better understanding of their own racial identity. It may be appropriate, however, to conclude the *Who We Are* series by drawing on its lessons in order to set out a few very concise guidelines for addressing ourselves to the task ahead:

- 1) The duration of the task will be decades, at the least, and perhaps centuries. History has a very great inertia; a historical process of long duration may culminate suddenly in a single, cataclysmic event, but every major development in the history of the race has had deep roots and has grown in soil thoroughly prepared for it by preceding developments. The course of history now, so far as our race is concerned, is steeply downward, and to change its direction will be no overnight matter, nor will this be accomplished by any gimcrack scheme which promises success without first building a foundation for that success, block by carefully laid block.
- 2) The workers at the task will be only a tiny minority of the race. Any program which envisages an “awakening of the masses” or which relies on the native wisdom of the great bulk of our people—which is to say, any populist program—is based on a false vision and a false understanding of the nature of the masses. No great, upward step in all of our long history has ever been accomplished by the bulk of any population, but always by an exceptional individual or a few exceptional individuals. The masses always take the path of least resistance: which is to say, they always follow the strongest faction. It is important to work with the masses, to inform them, to influence them, to recruit from among them; but they must not be counted on for determinative, spontaneous support until after a small minority has already, by its own efforts, built a stronger force than that of any opposing faction.
- 3) The task is inherently fundamental, and it will be accomplished only through a fundamental approach. That is to say, those who devote themselves to it must be pure in spirit and mind; they must understand that their goal is a society based on quite different values from those underlying the present society, and they must be committed wholeheartedly and without reservation to that goal; they must be prepared to outgrow all the baggage of superstition and convention inherent in the present society. Thus, the task is not one for conservatives or right wingers, for “moderates” or liberals, or for any of

those whose thinking is mired in the errors and in the corruption which have led us to the downward course, but it is a task for those capable of an altogether new consciousness of the world.

The task is a biological, cultural, and spiritual one as well as an educational and political one. Its goal has meaning only with reference to a particular type of person, and if this type cannot be preserved while the educational and political aspects of the task are being performed, then the goal cannot be achieved. If the task cannot be completed in a single generation, then there must exist, somewhere, a social milieu which reflects and embodies the cultural and spiritual values associated with the goal, and serves to pass these values from one generation to the next. The preservation of a social milieu, just as the preservation of a gene pool, requires a degree of isolation from alien elements: the longer the duration of the task, the higher the degree. This requirement may be difficult of fulfillment, but it is essential. What should be envisaged, then, is a task with both an internal, or community-oriented aspect, and an external, or political-educational-recruiting aspect. As the task progresses and both external and internal conditions vary, the relative weight given to the two aspects will undoubtedly vary as well.

The task set out here is a very large one, and accomplishing it will require greater will, intelligence, and selflessness than demanded from the race in any previous crisis. The danger we face now, from the enemy within our gates as well as the one still outside, is greater than the one we faced from the deracinated Romans in the first century, the Huns in the fifth century, the Moors in the eighth century, or the Mongols in the 13th century. If we do not overcome it, we will have no second chance.

What we must do, however, is understand that all our resources in the coming struggle must come from within ourselves; there will be no outside help, no miracles. If this *Who We Are* series has helped even a few of us better understand ourselves and the resources therein, then it has accomplished its purpose.

National Vanguard (May 1978 - May 1982).

From the editor's desk

A witches' brew

William Pierce, in *Who We Are*, said in his concluding remarks: "It is difficult to analyze the witches' brew and place exactly the proper amount of blame on each ingredient."

It seems to me that from Pierce's point of view the Jewish problem would be a very strong catalyst that has accelerated the process of Western malaise in the last centuries, but certainly not the active ingredient of the brew.

I for one believe that individualism, universalism, weak ethnocentrism ("hardwired" characteristics in the White psyche since prehistoric times) plus egalitarianism, liberalism, capitalism (cultural "software" after the Revolution which ironically strengthened Christian axiology) plus the empowerment of Jewry since the times of Napoleon has created a lethal brew for the White peoples, as we shall see in the next section.

Part V

The Aryan problem: Ethno-suicide

Formal texts

Our race has had some really bad ideas over the ages: Alexander the Great telling all his soldiers to miscegenate, the Roman Empire making “citizens” out of aliens, the Aryan prince who founded Buddhism abolishing the caste system, White rulers in Egypt and Persia letting their countries go dark, not to mention the simple infighting and disorganization that would make our race easy prey for Jews or Muslims. Frankly, the existence of Buddhism should scare the White Nationalists who can’t think of anything but Jews.

—Vance Stubbs

Three texts

by Revilo Oliver



If you search the annals of mankind for a parallel to the strict materialism and concomitant atheism that is the premise of a very large part of the dominant thought of our time and simply taken for granted by many of our best minds, you will find the closest parallel in the philosophy called Lokayata, of which traces remain in the next-to-oldest parts of the *Mahabharata*, in the *Arthasastra*, and in a few other ancient works in Sanskrit. It is quite clear that this virtually scientific materialism flourished while the Aryan conquerors of India were in the plenitude of their power, and vanished as completely as though it had never been when the natives of that sub-continent succeeded, by such devices as miscegenation, military imitation, and exploitation of rivalries, in breaking the Aryan power and racial consciousness.

Late in the sixth century B.C. a young Aryan prince named Siddhartha, doubtless influenced by the Lokayata prevalent in intellectual circles, evolved an atheistic pessimism that differed from a strict materialism only in the assumption that an individual's will-to-live (as distinct from his mind and personality) could survive his death. This palingenesis of the will (which must be sharply distinguished from the reincarnation of a soul) strikingly resembled the basis of the modern philosophy of Schopenhauer, and Siddhartha, yielding to our racial instinct to deduce and formulate universal laws, presented it as true for all men. His doctrine therefore appealed to sentimental Aryans who were concerned for "all mankind" and had an itch to "do good" for the lower races by pretending that those races were their equals.

They accordingly preached the philosophy of Siddhartha and gradually transformed that bleak pessimism into a religion complete with gods, saviors, and innumerable angels and demons, and they called Siddhartha "the Enlightener of Mankind" (*Buddha*). As an odd mixture of philosophy and religion, Buddhism became the Established Religion of India, consummated the mongrelization of the Aryans and their submergence in the prolific native races, and then, its work of subversion accomplished, it disappeared from India and survived only as a grossly superstitious religion in Tibet, China, Japan, and adjacent Mongolian territories, and, with many doctrinal differences, in Ceylon and Southeast Asia, where it appears to have become as decadent as Christianity among us.

Book on the Jewish problem

It may also be significant that the Christians have always used the normal Jewish techniques of fraud and forgery, most obviously when they concocted gospels that purport to have been written by eyewitnesses of miraculous and impossible events. The evidence does not permit us to affirm that Christianity was cunningly invented by the Jews as a means of paralysing the healthy instincts of other races, but we can affirm that if the Jews did set out to devise a mental poison that would eventually be lethal to our race, they could have concocted no drug that was more efficacious in the circumstances.

I emphatically call your attention to the obvious fact that the primitive Christian doctrine is a specific demand for the suicide of our race, which survived from the end of the Roman Empire to the present only because our ancestors, of fresh barbarian stock, simply ignored in practice a large part of the pernicious doctrine, especially in northern Europe under essentially aristocratic regimes. Until the disintegration of Protestantism made it possible for any ambitious tailor, clever confidence man, or disgruntled housewife to have "revelations" and pitch the woo at lower classes to make themselves important or fleece the suckers, the professional holy men either contented themselves with telling our people they were "sinful" or used the common devices of theologians to conceal the import of

the holy book. (Even so, however, the Catholic dervishes are obviously responsible for the eventual dominance of mestizos in “Latin” America, and many similar misfortunes.)

For the deplorable acceptance of Christianity by the ignorant barbarians of our race, I have tried to account in my book, *Christianity and the Survival of the West*. I would now change nothing in that discussion except to make it more emphatic, for in the years since I wrote it, I have come to the conclusion that, with only numerically insignificant exceptions, the Christians are useless in any effort to preserve our race, and that our domestic enemies are, from their standpoint, well advised to subsidize, as they are now doing, the ranting of evangelical shamans and the revival of menticidal superstitions by every means, including the hiring of technicians who can pose as “scientists” and “prove,” by subtle or impudent tricks, the “truth” of the flimsiest hoaxes and the most preposterous notions. The development of Christianity in all the sects of the Western world during the past two centuries has been the progressive elimination from all of them of the elements of our natively Aryan morality that were superimposed on the doctrine before and during the Middle Ages to make it acceptable to our race and so a religion that could not be exported as a whole to other races. With the progressive weakening of our racial instincts, all the cults have been restored to conformity with the “primitive” Christianity of the holy book, i.e., to the undiluted poison of the Jewish originals. I should, perhaps, have made it more explicit in my little book that the effective power of the alien cult is by no means confined to sects that affirm a belief in supernatural beings. As I have stressed in other writings, when the Christian myths became unbelievable, they left in the minds of even intelligent and educated men a residue, the detritus of the rejected mythology, in the form of superstitions about “all mankind,” “human rights,” and similar figments of the imagination that had gained currency only on the assumption that they had been decreed by an omnipotent deity, so that in practical terms we must regard as basically Christian and religious such irrational cults as Communism and the tangle of fancies that is called “Liberalism” and is the most widely accepted faith among our people today. I am a little encouraged that today some of the more intelligent “Liberals” are at last perceiving that their supposedly rational creed is simply based on the Christian myths they have consciously rejected. I note, for example, that Mary Kenny, who describes herself as “a former radical” (*The Sunday Telegraph*, 27 January 1980, pp. 8-9), has come to the realization that “so many of the [Liberals’] political ideas... are religious at root. The search for equality in the secular sense is a replacement of the Judaeo-Christian idea that God loves every individual equally... The feelings of guilt or, indeed, pity, which once went into the religious drive, are being transferred to secular ideas to the ultimate destruction of our civilisation.”

So far as there is hope for us, it lies, I think, in this belated tendency to take account of biological realities.

The Doom on Nations. In the foregoing pages I have tried only to suggest what seem to me to be the most important phenomena that must be taken into account in forming an objective estimate of the Jews and in considering dispassionately the present plight of our race and the doom that seems to hang over our children and over ourselves, unless we are individuals who have already come *prope ad ipsos exactae aetatis terminos*.

I do not know what, if anything, can be done to preserve a species that some judicious observers believe to be driven by a largely subconscious, but irresistible, death-wish. In 1914, although we had the Jews on our backs, we were indubitably the dominant race on earth; we are now a despised and degraded species of anthropoids on whom all other species, including the very lowest and most brutish, joyously feed. When I see that our people are either too doltish to perceive their degradation or too craven to care, I am close to despair. Even a few decades ago, I should not have believed it possible that here in the United States Aryans would willingly see their children hauled to “schools” to be defiled by enforced association with savages and to be robbed, beaten, raped, and mutilated by the animals... Are creatures that accept such degradation capable of survival or even fit to live? Is it only that they have been enslaved by foul superstitions, or have their brains been so clotted by centuries of systematic poisoning that they have been rendered permanently and irremediably imbecile?

When the Jews invade a nation, their first concern is, as prudence demands, to acquire control over the minds of their victims. In the middle of the Nineteenth Century, Lord Harrington told Parliament that the Jews already controlled “a large portion” of the British press, and, of course, in other Aryan countries they had been equally or more successful. Less than a century later, their control over all the means of communication within every Aryan nation had become virtually absolute, although a few small journals are still permitted to publish some articles that the occupying power has not approved. In this connection, it is well to remember the dictum of Dzhughashvili (alias Stalin) that a periodical with a circulation of 10,000 or less was not worth capturing or suppressing. It is also true that the Jews need to have a little open opposition to maintain the fiction that they are “persecuted,” and it is possible that they have encouraged on a small scale the more absurd and impractical forms of “anti-Semitism” for precisely that purpose. But they seem now to feel that they may safely exhibit their arrogance and to have resolved that no Aryan cur shall be permitted to bark at his owners or even to whimper audibly.

For all practical purposes, the natural aristocracy of our race, which once gave it some sense of direction, has been totally destroyed, by revolutionary massacres, by contrived wars for hallucinatory ends, by economic looting under the guise of “democracy,” by internal corruption through the fostering of its vices, and by miscegenation. We are left with what is, on the whole, an Aryan proletariat, differentiated only by income, and, especially if the income is somewhat above average, willing to submit to anything and even to do anything for a few additional dollars, pounds, or rand. Our entire population, with almost no significant exceptions, is now at the mercy of, and therefore enslaved by, the

economic pressures which the Jews exert at the first signs of disaffection. Our race's traditional suspicion of "tradesmen" was only realistic. The man whose income depends on vending to the masses is always subject to temptations to profit that are likely to be stronger than any moral restraints he may theoretically acknowledge, and today he is no more than a slave at the mercy of his masters. Even more precarious is the status of those who have no material goods to sell, such as authors, journalists, actors, clergymen and other soothsayers... whose livelihood depends entirely on the sale of words, mere sounds whether spoken or written, to masses whose tastes have been formed by the formidable machinery that controls their minds. These facts of economic enslavement lead many acute observers to the conclusion that our race's only chance of survival lies in the chance that the Jews, blinded by their own arrogant confidence in their absolute superiority, will permit or precipitate a total collapse of organized society into the anarchy in which the strong and resolute will again survive at the expense of the weak and foolish.

Book on the Christian problem

The foregoing pages were written in March and April, 1969, as a sequel to my article, "After Fifty Years," and were to be published first as a series of articles and then as a booklet on behalf of the newly formed National Youth Alliance.

I was unwilling to have the booklet published under other auspices because conversations with some very influential Christians showed me the futility of trying to talk sense to them. Their plan for salvaging the nation consisted of cursing the Jews and repudiating reason by reciting the mantram, "A little child shall lead them." They could not remember that precisely that phrase had been the inspiration of the Children's Crusade, which succeeded only in filling the slave-markets of the Near East with a choice breed of biped cattle.

I also observed that, on the whole, American "conservatives" and "anti-Communists" seem to be either unwilling or unable to learn anything from the total and unmitigated failure of all their efforts for the past fifty years. They have dwindled to a little band of aged and aging men and women who now can talk only to themselves, repeating ever more shrilly their futile anachronisms, closing their eyes more tightly to avoid seeing the world of today, and retreating ever farther into a realm of fantasy filled with good fairies and wicked witches who can be summoned or exorcised with magic words. And they have, inadvertently and unwittingly, made patriotic organizations almost a monopoly of confidence men who cynically sell them fallacious hopes and comforting fictions.

The last years of the late Whittaker Chambers were overshadowed by a bleak pessimism of which some adumbrations appear in the pages of his *Witness* and the posthumous

book, *Cold Friday* (1964). He was convinced that the American people are actuated by a subconscious, but ineradicable and irresistible, death-wish—a subliminal longing for extinction that makes them turn in fury on anyone who tries to make possible their survival. Before his death in 1962 so drastic a conclusion, extending the effects of morbid psychological states and degenerative diseases to an entire population or even an entire race, seemed highly improbable and could be dismissed as a reflection of the bitterness of his own experience. But another decade has produced no evidence that Chambers was not right. We usually tell ourselves that our domestic enemies have stealthily captured all of our means of information and communication, and now administer through the schools, the liepapers, and the boob-tubes a corrosive brainwashing that accounts for the ovine apathy of our people as they are herded toward national suicide, but it seems a little odd that our people should have been so obtuse as to permit that capture, and we cannot categorically deny that what we optimistically attribute to systematic brainwashing may have a deeper and hidden cause.

Our race is a biological species, and our peculiar intelligence, like the gorilla's mighty shoulders, once gave us dominance over other species. But what we must now objectively observe in our behavior is not really the gorilla's apathy. It is something much worse: a perverse and idiotic delight in whatever weakens us and strengthens our enemies. This morbid racial masochism is now most conspicuous in the United States and Britain, where we are not only doing everything in our power to subsidize and accelerate the breeding of voracious parasites to impoverish, degrade, and destroy us, but are also applying the most effective biological techniques to breed ourselves into imbecility and eventual extinction.

Six years ago in my *Conspiracy or Degeneracy?* I asked the one crucial question: Have we, the men of the West, lost the will to live?

Nothing, certainly, has happened since then to suggest a negative answer. To be sure, after some sensationally flagitious outrage to our race, a considerable number of men, invariably the least "educated," mutter angrily among themselves; and in a city of almost two million some fifty men and women may boldly assemble to voice their protest, thus embarrassing the vast majority of Aryans, who hasten to assure the world that their heads are so stuffed with mush that they love their Enemies and hope for nothing better than the privilege of being spat-on and kicked some more. And if the outrage is widely reported, the computers will whirr more loudly as they churn out appeals to patriotic suckers, and the travelling salesmen will drive harder as they rush from chapter-meeting to chapter-meeting to meet a temporarily increased demand for patriotic paregoric to soothe nervous stomachs. Nowhere can one discern the slightest indication that in the great majority of our people the racial instinct of self-preservation has not been lost.

The question remains unanswered, however, for we cannot yet determine whether the instinct has been extinguished or is merely in abeyance while our people are in a kind of cataleptic trance from which they may be roused by physical suffering and acute privation

when the times comes, as it assuredly will in a few years. In the meantime the question remains open, although our fragmentary data point to an affirmative answer—to the loss of the will to live. The laws of biological processes, like the law of gravitation, are constant and unalterable; they cannot be evaded by magic or oratory or whimpering; and it would be supremely silly to expostulate with a people that is not biologically fit to survive.

All these considerations confirmed my decision to withhold these pages from the press. This booklet is now published at the instance of Mr. Richard Cotten, who refuses to despair of the future, and who has himself set an example of perseverance in the face of great odds.

The economic status of our ruined nation is apparent to professional economists, who now speculate only about the date at which the counterfeit dollars printed by the Federal Reserve will be declared worthless and replaced by new counterfeits. And the goals of “education” are made more obvious by the “university” in California that has proudly established a special “curriculum” for homosexuals.

If you listen perceptively to the young who have not yet been permanently deranged by drugs and depravity, you will see that their febrile emotionalism, their promiscuity, their ostentatious clamor or indifference, their mercurial inconstancy, all mask an underlying and subconscious despair that is terribly significant.

Our situation is desperate, and we can afford no illusions, no retreat into a land of dreams. Now, more than ever, *optimism is cowardice*.

We are born into this time, and there is no escape from it save in death. If the courage of our ancestors was not entombed with them, if their ability to meet desperate perils with clear-sighted resolution was transmitted to their heirs, if their will to live is not extinct in us, our race and our civilization may yet survive.

If, as I am told, this little booklet can make even the slightest contribution to our survival, its publication is justified.

The first and the last texts have been excerpted from Oliver’s 1973 *Christianity and the Survival of the West*; the middle text, from *The Jewish Strategy* published posthumously in 2002.

Race and religion

by Tomislav Sunic

There is a widespread idea among White nationalists worldwide that Whites need to resurrect their Christian heritage in order to be better able to retrieve their racial, religious and cultural identity. Another proposal common among White nationalists is that the liberal system needs to put an end to non-White, non-Christian immigration, which would then pave the way for polishing up the vanishing White gene pool. Another far-flung idea is that the influence of Jews must be curtailed if not stopped altogether, so that all social ills can be cured. Last but not least, the liberal system needs to be replaced by a nationalist, nativist, populist, “right wing,” White government.

However credible these proposals sound, they are naive in their formulations, superficial in scope, and dangerous in their possible implementation. They deal with the political consequences of the problem rather than probing into its philosophical and historical causes. Even if miraculously all non-White, non-Christian residents were to disappear from America and the European Union and even if all liberal policies were to be abandoned, it is unlikely that the White man would solve deep-rooted problems of his own racial and religious identity.

Science and quackery

Before even attempting to offer some salutary suggestions, one must be aware of the oppressive weight of the dominant ideas and their “scientific”—a.k.a. “politically correct”—ambience in the modern liberal system. Our postmodern epoch is profoundly saturated by egalitarian and economic dogmas. Regardless how much empirical artillery one can muster in defence of the uniqueness of the White gene pool, and regardless of how many facts one can enumerate that point to diverse intellectual achievements of different races, no such evidence will elicit social or academic approval. In fact, if loudly uttered, the evidence may be considered a felony in some Western countries. In our so-called free and secular society, new religions, such as the religion of racial promiscuity and the theology of the free market have replaced the old Christian belief system. Only when these new secular dogmas or political theologies start crumbling down—which may soon be the case—alternative views about race and the meaning of the sacred may appear.

The historical irony is that it was not the Other, i.e. the non-White, who invented the arsenal of bashing the White man. It was the White man himself—both with his Christian atonement and now with his liberal expiation of the feelings of guilt. Therefore, any arguments offered in defence of racial separation will inevitably be perceived by the Other, i.e. by a non-White (and his guilt-ridden White masters) as racist. Not wanting to contravene the moral imperatives that they invented, Western man must once again posture as an example of global justice that needs to be copied by all races—albeit this time around as a negative role model.

Alain de Benoist writes that liberalism has been a racist system *par excellence*. In the late 19th century, it preached exclusive racism. Now, in the 21st century it preaches inclusive racism. By herding non European races from all over the world into a rootless a-racial and a-historical agnostic consumer society and by preaching ecumenical miscegenation, the West nonetheless holds its undisputed role of a truth maker—of course, this time around under the auspices of the self-hating, self-flagellating White male.

It must be stated that it was not the Colored, but the White man who had crafted the ideology of self-denial and the concomitant ideology of universal human rights, as well as the ideas of interracial promiscuity. Therefore, any modest scholarly argument suggesting proofs of racial inequality is untenable today. How can one persuasively argue about the existence of different races if the modern system lexically, conceptually, scientifically, ideologically, theologically, and last, but not least, judicially, forbids the slightest idea of race segregation—except when it evokes skin-deep exotic escapades into musical and culinary prowess of non-European races?

Most American White nationalists use Thomas Jefferson as their patron saint, frequently associating his name with “good old times” of the American Declaration of Independence. Those were the times when the White man was indeed in command of his destiny. The White founding fathers stated: *“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”* Yet the abstract words “all men” combined with the invocation of a deistic and distant “creator” had a specific significance in the mind of Enlightenment-groomed Jefferson. Two hundred years later, however, his words ring a different bell in the ears of a real Muslim Somali or a Catholic Cholo planning to move to the United States.

Who can, therefore deny to masses of non-European non-Christian immigrants from all parts of the world to freely extrapolate, for their own racial benefit, Jefferson’s words that “all men are created equal”? The self-perception of Jefferson and his Enlightenment-influenced compatriots of 18th-century Europe and America were light miles away from the perception of his words by today’s non-Whites in search of “the American dream.” Wailing and whining that “Jefferson did not mean this; he meant that”—is a waste of

time. Similar to many historical documents claiming “scientific “ or “self-evident” nature, be they of the religious, historical or judicial provenance, the American Declaration bears witness to the classical cleavage between the former signifier and the modern signified which has become the subject of its own semantic sliding—with ominous consequences for Whites worldwide.

A witty Southern antebellum lawyer, a racist writer, with a good sense of the language, John Fitzhugh, calls Jefferson’s words “abstractions”:

The verbal tricks such as “we hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal” are bottomless pits out of which torrents of modern new demands keep arising. It is, we believe, conceded on all hands, that men are not born physically, morally or intellectually equal—some are males, some females, some from birth large, strong, and healthy, others weak, small and sickly—some are naturally amiable, others prone to all kinds of wickedness—some brave others timid. [George Fitzhugh, *Sociology for the South, or the Failure of Free Society* 1854, pp. 177-178]

Contemporary geneticists and biologists are no less vulnerable than philosophers and sociologists to dominant political theologies. What was considered scientific during the first part of the 20th century in Europe and the United States by many prominent scholars writing about race is viewed today as preposterous and criminal. The dominant dogma idea of egalitarianism must give its final blessing in explaining or explaining away any scientific discovery.

This is particularly true regarding the endless debate about “nature vs. nurture” (heredity vs. environment). If one accepts the dominant idea that the factor of environment (“nurture”) is crucial in shaping the destiny of different races—then it is useless to talk about differences among races. If all individuals, all races, are equal, they are expandable and replaceable at will... Needless to say, Franke, Lenz and thousands of German and other European anthropologists, geneticists and biologists disappeared from the reading list, after being denounced either as “bad Nazis” or “atheists.”

Racial promiscuity in the age of high IQ morons

“Dorks,” “idiots,” “morons,” “halfwits,” “dimwits,” are words used daily in the portrayal of our pesky interlocutors. But what if some of our intelligent interlocutors are indeed stupid? It is a historical truism that most world explorers, famous statesmen, most scientists, most Nobel prize winners, have been White people with predominantly Nordic stature and dolichocephalic skull. It is a truism that most prisoners in America and Europe are crossbreeds of non-European out-groups, with the remnants of Whites, whose criminal record can be traced to inborn genetic disorders in their family tree. A long time ago William Sadler, a forgotten eugenicist from the Chicago Medical School, wrote a book

about “the aristocracy of the unfit” that cannot be improved by any amount of do-good sermonizing: “Mental defectiveness (moronism) is hereditary and constitutional, and consequently not amenable to our preachings, asylums, hospitals, reformatories, penitentiaries, etc. We must ever bear in mind that each year a new quota of defectives is born with statistical regularity.” (*Race Decadence*, 1922, p. 254).

The modern media-induced dumbing down process, combined with inborn mental deficiencies of an ever growing number of White people is being accelerated by massive inflow of low IQ immigrants, already conditioned to capitalize on post-Christian and liberal guilt feelings of the White man. As in the ex-Soviet Union, the dominant theology of egalitarianism and TV shows incessantly role-modeling interracial sex only accelerate the culture of mediocrity and the culture of death.

People get arrested for financial fraud or homicide. Yet professors in humanities in America and Europe, when propagating Lamarckian science-fiction and egalitarian pipe dreams get promoted. A physiologist and a Nobel Prize winner, the late French racist Charles Richet, in his book “The Stupid Man” (*L’homme stupide*, 1919), understood that high IQ is not a trademark of intellectual disinterestedness or a sign of value-free judgments. Stupid, abnormal decisions are often made by high IQ people, who are driven by utopian belief systems.

High IQ among Whites, if not accompanied of good character, psychological introspection, nobility of spirit and a sense of honor—is worthless. The architects of the largest serial genocides in the history of mankind, writes Rudolf Kommos (*Juden hinter Stalin*, 1938, 1944), were intelligent Bolsheviks, mostly of Jewish origin, whose inborn millenarian, eschatological and chiliastic mindset, had led them to believe that dozens of millions of Russian civilians needed be wiped out.

Stupidity does not mean that a person has not understood something; rather it means that he behaves as if he did not understand anything. When a person moves headlong toward disaster in order to satisfy his prejudices, his errors, his defective and false reasoning—this is inexcusable. It is far better to be deprived of intelligence than to make poor use of it. [Charles Richet, *L’homme stupide*, 1919, p. 15, my trans.]

European and American history has been full of highly intelligent individuals endorsing abnormal religious and political beliefs. This is particularly true for many contemporary White European and American left-leaning academics who, although showing high IQ, are narrow-minded, spineless individuals of no integrity, or race traitors of dubious character. Low IQ Cholos or affirmative action Blacks are just happy pawns in their conspiratorial and suicidal game. The father of European racialism and a man whose work left an important impact on the study of race in the early 20th century, Georges Vacher de Lapouge, summarized how cultivated men, when driven by theological or ideological passions, commit deadly mistakes:

It is virtually impossible to change by means of education the intellectual type of an individual, however intelligent he may be. Any education will be impotent to provide him with audacity and initiative. It is heredity that decides on his gifts. I was often surprised by the intensity of gregarious spirit amidst the most instructed men... Each minor manifestation of an independent idea hurts them; they reject a priori everything as pernicious errors that has not been taught to them by their masters. [Georges Vacher de Lapouge, *Les sélections sociales*, 1896, p.104; my trans.]

Is this not a proof that the worst enemy of the White man can often be his fellow White man?

The pristine, pastoral and puerile picture of the White race, so dearly longed for by modern White nationalists, is daily belied by permanent religious bickering, jealousy and character smearing within the White rank and file. Add to that murderous intra-White wars that have rocked Europe and America for centuries, one wonders whether the proverbial and much vaunted Aryan, Promethean, and Faustian man, is worthy of a better future.

For the greater glory of God

Surely, the White man saved Greco-Roman Europe from the Levantine Hannibal's incursion, which nearly resulted in a catastrophe in 216 b.c. at Cannae, in southern Italy. The White man also stopped Attila's Hunic hordes on the Catalaunian Fields in France in 451 a.d. The grandfather of Charlemagne, Charles Martel, defeated Arab predators near Tours, in France in 732. One thousand years later in 1717, a short and slim Italo-French Catholic hero, Prince Eugene of Savoy, finally removed the Islamic threat from the Balkans.

But the unparalleled White will to power, couched later on in Christian millenarianism, had also prompted large crusades against "infidels." Their commander in chief, the pious Godfrey de Bouillon, did not have pangs of consciousness after his knights had put to the sword thousands of Muslim civilians in captured Jerusalem in 1099 a.d. All was well meant for the greater glory of Yahweh!

The power of the newly discovered universal religion and the expectancy of the "end of history," later to be followed by bizarre beliefs in "global democracy," often eclipsed racial awareness among Whites. As a rule, when White princes ran out of Muslim or Jewish infidels—they began whacking each other in the name of their Semitic deities or latter day democracies. The 6'4" tall Charlemagne, in the name of his anticipated Christian bliss, went on the killing spree against his fellow pagan Germans. In 782 a.d. he decapitated

several thousand of the finest crop of Nordic Saxons, thereby earning himself a saintly name of the “butcher of the Saxons” (*Sachsenschlächter*).

And on and on the story goes with true Christian or true democracy believers. No Jews, no Arabs, no communists have done so much damage to the White gene pool as Whites themselves. The Thirty Years War (1617–1647) fought amidst European Christians with utmost savagery, wiped out two thirds of the finest German racial stock, over 6 million people. The crazed papist Croatian mercenaries, under Wallenstein’s command, considered it a Royal and Catholic duty to kill off Lutherans, a dark period so well described by the great German poet and dramatist Friedrich Schiller. Even today in Europe the words “Croat years” (*Kroatenjahre*) are associated with the years of hunger and pestilence.

Nor did Oliver Cromwell’s troops—his Ironsides—during the English civil war, fare much better. Surely, as brave Puritans they did not drink, they did not whore, they did not gamble—they only specialized in skinning Irish Catholic peasants alive. Not only did their chief, the Nordic looking fanatic Cromwell consider himself more Jewish than the Jews—he actually brought them back from continental Europe, with far-reaching consequence both for England and America.

A slim, intelligent, Nordic looking, yet emotionally unstable manic depressive, William Sherman, burnt down Atlanta in 1864—probably in the hopes of fostering a better brand of democracy for the South. We may also probe some day into the paleocortex of the Nordic skull of an airborne Midwest Christian ex-choir boy, who joyfully dropped firebombs on German civilians during World War II. The results may not be too difficult to detect considering that the same Biblical mindset was re-enacted in 2002 in Iraq by G. W. Bush and his advisors enraptured by Talmudic tales of “weapons of mass destruction.” Biblical or liberal-democratic crimes, when couched in political choseness and theological messianism are perfect tools for a perfectly good consciousness.

Many European White nationalists are dazed at good looking Nordic men and women from the Bible Belt raving, ranting and dancing on TV in trance to Christian-Zionist tunes. Equally stunned are American White nationalists when they observe blood-stained victimhood quarrels pitting Irish against English nationalists, Serb against Croat nationalists, Ukrainian against Russian nationalists, Walloon against Flemish nationalists, Polish against German nationalists, and so on and on.

The faith or the sacred?

No subject is so dangerous to address among White nationalists as the Christian religion. It is commendable to lambast Muslims, who are on the respectable hit-parade of the Axis of Evil. Jews also come in handy in a wholesale package of evil, which needs to be

expiated—at least occasionally. But any critical examination of Judeo-Christian intolerance is viewed with suspicion and usually attributed to distinct groups of White people, such as agnostics or modern day self-proclaimed pagans.

Why did the White man accept the Semitic spiritual baggage of Christianity even though it did not quite fit with his racial-spiritual endowments? The unavoidable racist thinker Hans Günther—a man of staggering erudition and knowledgeable not only of the laws of heredity, but also of comparative religions—reminds us that the submissive and slavish relation of man to God is especially characteristic of Semitic peoples. In his important little book, *The Religious Attitudes of the Indo-Europeans*, he teaches us about the main aspects of racial psychology of old Europeans. We also learn that Yahweh is a merciless totalitarian god who must be revered—and feared.

Ancient Europeans did not believe in any kind of salvation. They believed in inexorable destiny. Gods were their friends and enemies, as seen in ancient Greece and Rome. Among old Europeans the notion of polarity between Heaven and Earth, between soul and body, i.e., dualism of any kind, was nonexistent. Man was part of an organic whole, embedded in his tribe and race, and tolerant of others' religious ideas.

The messianic, chiliastic, or “communistic” mindset was unknown among ancient Europeans. They could not care less which gods other races, other tribes or other peoples believed in. Wars that they fought against the adversary were bloody, but they did not have the goal of converting the adversary and imposing on him the beliefs contrary to his racial heritage. Homer's epic *The Iliad* is the best example. The self-serving, yet truly racist liberal-communistic endeavour, to wage “final and just war” in order to “make the world safe for democracy,” was something inconceivable for ancient Europeans.

A German-British racist author of the early 20th century, Houston Stewart Chamberlain in his *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* writes that “a final judgment shows the intellectual renaissance to be the work of Race in opposition to the universal Church which knows no Race” (p. 326). Unlike Christianity, which preaches individual salvation, for ancient Europeans life can only have a meaning within the in-group—their tribe, their polis, or their *civitas*. Outside those social structures, life means nothing.

In the 1st century, words of far-reaching consequence for all Whites were pronounced by a Jewish heretic, the Apostle St. Paul, to the people of Galatia, an area in Asia Minor once populated by the Gauls (i.e., Celts). Galatia was then well underway to become a case study of multicultural debauchery—similar to today's Los Angeles: “You are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus, for all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. If you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.” (Galatians 3:28). Christianity became thus a Universalist religion with a special mission to transform the Other into the Same. The

seeds of egalitarianism—albeit on the religious, not yet on the secular level—were sown. The pagan notion of the mystical sacred was gradually being displaced by the dogmatic notion of one omnipotent faith.

Although Christian Churches never publicly endorsed racial miscegenation, they did not endorse racial segregation either. This was true for the Catholic Church and its flock, as observed by the early French sociologist and racist Gustave Le Bon. Consequently, Catholic Spaniards of White racial stock in Latin America could not halt decadence and debauchery in their new homelands as WASPs in North America did—at least prior to the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In 1938, in light of eugenic and racial laws adopted not only in Germany and Italy, but also in other European countries and many states in America, Pope Pius IX made his famous statement: “It is forgotten that mankind is one large and overwhelming Catholic race.” This statement was to become part of his planned encyclical under the name *The unity of the human race*.

“The unity of the human race,” as noble as these words may sound, is a highly abstract concept. On a secular level communist and liberal intellectuals constantly toy with it—in order to suppress real tribes, real nations, real peoples and their real racial uniqueness. Even if this white race, constantly defamed as “wicked,” “racist,” “bigoted” and “fascist,” disappeared from the face of the earth, non-White immigrants know that they would soon have to climb back onto their native tree or return to their despotic cave.

Each religion is exclusive and exclusionary, which inevitably results in downplaying or, even worse, in denial of other religions. By definition, all Christian denominations, in order to strengthen their theological credibility, have historically resorted to this type of “negative legitimacy.” Yet, despite devastating wars among Whites of different Christian persuasions, Christianity, as a whole, has retained its transcendental value, which has made life more or less liveable.

No longer is this the case with postmodern “civil religions” that ignore the sacred. Their nature of exclusion is already resulting in intellectual terror—that may soon be followed by real state-sponsored physical terror.

Civil religions also have their holy shrines, their holy relics, their pontiffs, their canons, their promises and their menaces. Failure to believe in them—or failure to at least pretend to believe in them—results, as a legal scholar of Catholic persuasion, Carl Schmitt wrote, in a heretic’s removal from the category of human beings. Among new civil religions one could enumerate the religion of multiculturalism, the religion of antifascism, the religion of the Holocaust, and the religion of economic progress.

Many Whites make a fundamental mistake when they portray new civil religions as part of an organized conspiracy of a small number of wicked people. In essence, civil religions are just secular transpositions of the Judeo-Christian monotheist mindset which, when combined with an inborn sense of tolerance and congenial naïveté of the White people, makes them susceptible to their enchanting effects.

The folly of the compound noun: “anti-Semitism”

As a result of semantic sliding of political concepts, the Jewish-born thinker and the father of the secular religion of communism, Karl Marx, would likely be charged today with “anti-Semitism” or the “incitement to racial hatred.” Leftist scholars usually do not wish to subject his little booklet, *On the Jewish Question* (1844) to critical analysis. Consider the following:

The Jew has emancipated himself in a Jewish manner, not only because he has acquired financial power, but also because, through him and also apart from him, money has become a world power and the practical Jewish spirit has become the practical spirit of the Christian nations. The Jews have emancipated themselves insofar as the Christians have become Jews.

Of particular significance is Marx’ last sentence “insofar as the Christians have become Jews.” In fact the White man has “jewified” himself by embracing the fundamentals of the Jewish belief system, which, paradoxically, he uses now in criticizing Jews. Christian anti-Semitism can be described, therefore, as a peculiar form of neurosis. Christian anti-Semites resent the Jews while mimicking the framework of resentment borrowed from Jews. Accordingly, even the Jewish god Yahweh was destined to become the anti-Semitic God of White Christians! In the name of this God, persecutions against Jews were conducted by White non-Jews. Simply put, the White non-Jew has been denying for centuries to the Jew his self-appointed “otherness,” i.e. his uniqueness and his self-chosenness, while desperately striving to re-appropriate that same Jewish otherness and that same uniqueness, be it in the acceptance of Biblical tales, be it the espousal of the concept of linear time, be it in the belief of the end of history.

To face up to the purported bad sides of Judaism by using Christian tools, is futile. This is the argument of the German philosopher Eugen Dühring, who notes that “Christianity is an offshoot of Judaism” and “a Christian, when he rightfully comprehends himself as such, cannot be a serious and complete anti-Semite” (*Die Judenfrage als Frage des Rassencharakters*, 1901). Dühring was a prominent German socialist philosopher, contemporary, but also a foe of Marx. Like most German socialist thinkers of the late 19th century he was an anti-Semite, in so far as he saw in the Jewry the incarnation of capitalism. Dühring notes that “historical Christianity, when observed in its true spirit, and

all things considered, has been a backlash within and against Judaism, but it has also emerged from it and to some extent in its fashion” (p. 25-26).

Gradually, the so-called intellectual anti-Semitism, based on economic and sociological factors, was replaced by racial anti-Semitism. As was to be expected, thousands of German scholars who had delved into the critical description of the racial traits of Jews disappeared after World War II from the radar screen, and their books went up in flames. As a rule, when they are quoted today in American or European academia by half-knowledgeable, tenure-scared professors, they are pathologized as “monsters” or proverbial “Nazis,” or their words are taken out of context.

Naturally, the question that comes to mind today is the meaning of natural law with the dogma that all people are equal. Is it possible to have the same constitutional rights for different peoples of different gene pools and different cultures? A Palestinian fellah views his rights differently from a New York-born Jewish *kibbutznik* on the West bank; an Aborigine from New Zealand has a different concept of justice than a White farmer; a Christian Orthodox Serb has a different concept of historical justice from his neighbour, a Muslim Albanian.

Anti-anti-Semitism

As a response to the world-wide communist and liberal attacks against the passage of the Nuremberg racial laws in 1935 in National Socialist Germany, Professor Walter Gross, Head of the Bureau of Racial Politics of the NSDAP, wrote:

The opinion has been kicked around the globe that Germany had invented sterilisation and that it has afterward medically and scientifically dressed it up exclusively in an effort to get rid of its opponents. This is complete insanity! If we really had an intention to make a political opponent harmless we would certainly not sterilize him as he would continue to live as happily ever after for the next sixty years at our expenses... The fact that we consider communism a hereditary disease that needs to be combated, the fact that procreation of the progeny must be prevented—while allowing communists to roam around freely—this is really a suggestion that in no way does justice to the opinion of the German people and its state. [Walter Gross, *Der deutsche Rassengedanke und die Welt*, 1939, p. 17–18]

Gross pleads for racial harmony of diverse nations and describes favourably racial and cultural endowments of the Japanese, while rejecting the accusation of German racial superiority over other races. He notes, however, that “no agreement is possible with theoretical systems of the international kind... because they are based on incredible lie, i.e. the lie of the equality of all people” (p. 30).

Another highly placed legal scholar in National Socialist Germany, professor at the Friedrich Wilhelm University in Berlin, Falk Ruttke, writes that

we will never solve the Jewish question through fanatical “anti-Semitism,” as the history of Judaism, not only in Germany, but the history from all over the world teaches us. The solution of the Jewish question is only possible through racial awareness (“*Rassengedanke*”) that is fair to each race. We shall never implement that unless we distinguish between nation and race. “*National Socialism is not anti-Semitic, it is a-Semitic.*” [Falk Ruttke, *Rasse, Recht und Volk* from *Jugend und Recht*, p. 30, 1937, italics in the original]

In his famous book about racial psychology of Jews, teeming with quotes by Orientalists, linguists, psychiatrists and other scholars, Hans Günther writes how Christianity, in adopting the Jewish god Yahweh, has ended up endorsing the concept of the “chosen people,” thereby greatly helping with the jewification (“*Verjudung*”) of the Western society. (p. 313)

Christian doctrines, historically speaking, paralyze the spirit of the West in its conventional and lasting dispute with the spirit of the Orient and in particularly with that of Judaism. Through its control of the press and intelligence service it is not at all difficult today for Jewry to give the *Zeitgeist* [spirit of the time] each time the direction that is most appropriate for Jews, while diverting the spiritual life of non-Jewish peoples away from their inborn spiritual values, always leading them to those spiritual values that appear as the most authoritative to Judaism. [p. 314]

In his numerous books the geneticist and biologist Fritz Lenz, who was held in high esteem by the scientific establishment in National Socialist Germany, examines the genetically conditioned proclivities among Jews, such as their extraordinary skill for moralistic pathos, the sense for empathy, mimicry, and the capability of provoking sentimental outbursts about painful injustice (“*Schmerzensezug*”) among deprived masses:

In revolutionary movements hysteric prone Jews play a big role because they can project themselves in utopian imaginations and therefore they can make convincing promises with far-reaching inner veracity... Not only Marx and Lasalle were Jews, but also in the recent times Eisner, Rosa Luxembourg, Leviné, Toller, Landauer, Trotsky and among others... Kahn, who praises the Jewish revolutionaries as the saviors of mankind and sees in them “a specific Jewish manner of the world-view and historical activity.” Lenz, *Menschliche Erblehre* [*A Lesson about Human Heredity*], 1936, p. 752–753

What German geneticists and anthropologists, such as Fritz Lenz, Hans Günther, Erwin Baur, Eugen Fischer and thousands of other scholars wrote about Jews had already been written and discussed—albeit from a philosophical, artistic and literary point of view—by thousands of European writers, poets and artists. From the ancient Roman thinker Tacitus to the English writer William Shakespeare, from the ancient Roman thinker Seneca, to the

French novelist and satirist, L. Ferdinand Céline, one encounters in the prose of countless European authors occasional and not so occasional critical remarks about the Jewish character—remarks that could easily be called today anti-Semitic. Should these “anti-Semitic” authors, novelists, or poets be called insane? If so, then the entire European cultural heritage must be banned and labeled insane.

Excluding the Jew, while using his theological and ideological concepts is a form of latent phobia among Whites, of which Jews are very well aware of. Criticizing a strong Jewish influence in Western societies on the one hand, while embracing Jewish religious and secular prophets on the other, will lead to further tensions and only enhance the Jewish sense of self-chosenness and their timeless victimhood. In turn, this will only give rise to more anti-Jewish hatred with tragic consequences for all. The prime culprits are not Jews or Whites, but rather a civil religion of egalitarianism with its postmodern offshoots of universalism and multiculturalism.

In postmodern “liquid” times words and concepts obtain liquid meanings. One of these words is the compound noun “anti-Semitism.” Anti-Semitism is also a new civil religion that can be used at will for smearing free thinkers. The point is not whether Jesus Christ looked like a proud White Galilean Aryan with a dolichocephalic skull and blond hair—as he is portrayed all over the world—or whether he needs to be pictured with hither-Asian, Semitic features similar to those of Bob Dylan and Bin Laden combined. The issue that needs to be addressed is why Whites, for two thousand years, have adhered to an alien, out-group, non-European conceptualization of the world.

Editor's note

The above text is an abridgement of Tomislav Sunic’s 2010 “Race and Religion: Awkward Friends of the White Man,” published in three parts at *The Occidental Observer*. It is worth mentioning that Sunic analyzes the Aryan problem and the Jewish question from a viewpoint so alien for typical white nationalists that no comment was posted in any of the three installments of the online piece.

A haunting novel

by Jared Taylor

Fiction can be more powerful than fact. Authors have always lent their talents to causes, often swaying events more effectively than journalists or politicians. Fiction, including virtually everything emitted by Hollywood, has usually been in the service of the left, but occasionally an author declares his allegiance to culture and tradition.

In *The Camp of the Saints*, Jean Raspail goes further and declares his allegiance to his race—though it is an allegiance tinged with bitterness at the weakness of the White man. It is the story of the final, tragic end of European civilization which falls, like all great civilizations, by its own hand.

The novel is set in the near future in France, where the leftist sicknesses of multiculturalism and multi-racialism have undermined all natural defenses. As Mr. Raspail writes of young Europeans:

That scorn of a people of other races, the knowledge that one's own is best, the triumphant joy at feeling oneself to be part of humanity's finest—none of that had ever filled these youngsters' addled brains, or at least so little that the monstrous cancer implanted in the Western conscience had quashed it in no time at all.

By then, “the White race was nothing more than a million sheep,” beaten down by decades of anti-White propaganda. As Mr. Raspail explains, it was “a known fact that racism comes in two forms: that practiced by Whites—heinous and inexcusable, whatever its motives—and that practiced by blacks—quite justified, whatever its excess, since it's merely the expression of a righteous revenge.”

This is the state of mind with which the West confronts its final crisis: nearly a million starving, disease-ridden boat people—men, women, and children—set sail from the Ganges delta for Europe. Practically no one is willing to say that this flotilla must be stopped at all costs. Instead, liberals and Christians spout confident nonsense about welcoming their Hindu brothers into the wealth and comfort of Europe.

Failure of churches to assist white flock. The thought of this wretched brown mass sailing for Europe is a source of great joy for the World Council of Churches. Its men are “shock-troop pastors, righteous in their loathing of anything and everything that smacked of present-day Western society, and Woodford Green, Essex in their love of whatever might destroy it.” They are determined “to welcome the million Christs on board those ships, who would rise up, reborn, and signal the dawn of a just, new day...”

One of the few Europeans who recognizes that what has come to be called the “Last Chance Armada” spells the doom of Christendom and reproaches a group of anti-Western churchmen: “There’s not one of you proud of his skin, and all that it stands for.” “Not proud or aware of it either,” replies one. “That’s the price we have to pay for the brotherhood of man. We’re happy to pay it.”

Europe is rife with fifth-column propagandists, products of earlier capitulations. Typical of these is Clement Dio, “citizen of France, North African by blood... who possessed a belligerent intellect that thrived on springs of racial hatred barely below the surface, and far more intense than anyone imagined.”

Europe’s fifth column. Knowing full well that acceptance of the first wave of third world refugees will only prompt imitators that will eventually swamp the White West, he writes happily about how “the civilization of the Ganges” will enrich a culturally bankrupt continent:

Considering all the wonders that the Ganges had bestowed on us already—sacred music, theatre, dance, yoga, mysticism, arts and crafts, jewellery, new styles in dress—the burning question was how we could manage to do without these folks any longer!

As the flotilla makes for Europe, schoolteachers set assignments for their students:

Describe the life of the poor, suffering souls on board the ships, and express your feelings toward their plight in detail, by imagining, for example, that one of the desperate families comes to your home and asks you to take them in.

The boat people steam towards the Suez Canal, but the Egyptians, not soft like Whites, threaten to sink the entire convoy. One hundred ships turn south, around the horn of Africa—towards Europe. The refugees run out of fuel for cooking and start burning their own excrement. Pilots sent to observe the fleet report an unbearable stench.

A few deluded Whites have boarded the ships in Calcutta and sail along with “the civilization of the Ganges,” dreaming of Europe:

Already they saw it their mission to guide the flock's first steps on Western soil. One would empty out all our hospital beds so that cholera-ridden and leprous wretches could sprawl between their clean White sheets. Another would cram our brightest, cheeriest nurseries full of monster children. Another would preach unlimited sex, in the name of the one, single race of the future...

The Hindus tolerate these traitors until almost the end of the voyage and then strangle them, throwing their naked bodies overboard so that they drift onto a Spanish beach as the armada heads for the south of France. The boat people have no need for guides of this kind, from a race that has lost all relevance:

The Last Chance Armada, en route to the West, was feeding on hatred. A hatred of almost philosophical proportions, so utter, so absolute, that it had no thoughts of revenge, or blood, or death, but merely consigned its objects to the ultimate void. In this case, the Whites. For the Ganges refugees, on their way to Europe, the Whites had simply ceased to be.

Finally, on the morning of Easter Sunday, the 100 creaking hulks crash onto the beaches. The local inhabitants have abandoned all thought of taking in a family of Hindus, and have fled north. Many of the fashionable leftist agitators have likewise left their editorial jobs and radio programs and disappeared, with their gold bars, to Switzerland. The army has been sent south to prevent a landing, but there are doubts as to whether Whites can be made to slaughter unarmed civilians.

As one government official explains to another, "Don't count on the army, monsieur. Not if you've got... genocide in mind."

The other replies: "Then it just means another kind of genocide... Our own."

At the last moment the French President is unable to give the order to fire. He urges the troops to act according to their consciences. They throw down their rifles and run.

Bands of hippies and Christians, who have come south to welcome their brown brothers also turn and run as soon as they get a whiff of the new arrivals. "How could a good cause smell so bad?"

Feeble resistance. The few remaining Whites with any sense of their civilization find they can communicate practically without speaking: "That was part of the Western genius, too: a mannered mentality, a collusion of aesthetes, a conspiracy of caste, a good-natured indifference to the crass and the common. With so few left now to share in its virtues, the current passed all the more easily between them."

A handful of citizens drive south with their hunting rifles on suicide missions to do the job their government is unable to do. One of these, ironically, is an assimilated Indian. As he explains to another band of citizen-hunters, “Every White supremacist cause—no matter where or when—has had blacks on its side. And they didn’t mind fighting for the enemy, either. Today, with so many Whites turning black, why can’t a few ‘darkies’ decide to be White? Like me.”

The Indian is killed, along with his White comrades, in an attack by fighter-bombers sent by the French government to put down resistance to the invasion. Soldiers who were unable to kill brown people make short work of “racist” Whites.

All over France non-Whites take the offensive. Algerians on assembly lines rise up and kill their White bosses. African street cleaners knock on the doors of deluxe Paris apartments and move in. A multi-racial government, including a few token Whites, announces a new dispensation.

Heading our way: refugees from the third world. Capitulation by the French means capitulation everywhere. Masses of ragged Chinese pour into Russia, whose troops are likewise unable to fire on hungry civilians. Huge fleets of beggars set sail from every pestilential southern port, heading for Europe, Australia, and New Zealand. The same drama unfolds in the United States. “Black would be black, and White would be White. There was no changing either, except by a total mix, a blend into tan. They were enemies on sight, and their hatred and scorn only grew as they came to know each other better.” Americans lay down their arms just as the French do.

Raspail hints here and there at what the new Europe will be like: “At the time, each refugee quarter had its stock of White women, all free for the taking. And perfectly legal. (One of the new regime’s first laws, in fact. In order to ‘demythify’ the White woman, as they put it.)”

The first provisional government also has a Minister of Population—a French woman married to a black—to ensure a permanent solution to the race problem. After all: “Only a White woman can have a White baby. Let her choose not to conceive one, let her choose only non-White mates, and the genetic results aren’t long in coming.”

It is all over for the white man. And so ends the saga of Western man, not in pitched battle, not in defeat at the hands of superior forces, but by capitulation.

Even after a quarter century, the novel is astonishingly current. It was written before Communism collapsed, and the new French revolution is spiced with anti-capitalist slogans that now sound slightly off key. One might also complain that a few of the

characters verge on caricature. Nevertheless, the central tragedy—suicidal White weakness—is brilliantly portrayed and could have been written in 1995.

Mr. Raspail obviously loves his culture and his race, and wrote in the afterward that although he had intended to end the book with a spasm of White self-consciousness that saves Europe, the final catastrophe seemed to write itself. Perhaps he could not, in good faith, write a different ending. In the preface to the 1985 French edition he observed:

The West is empty, even if it has not yet become really aware of it. An extraordinarily inventive civilization, surely the only one capable of meeting the challenges of the third millennium, the West has no soul left. At every level—nations, race, cultures as well as individuals—it is always the soul that wins the decisive battles.

The Camp of the Saints puts the White man's dilemma in the most difficult terms: slaughter hundreds of thousands of women and children or face oblivion. Of course, a nation that had the confidence to shed blood in the name of its own survival would never be put to such a test; no mob of beggars would threaten it.

The story that Mr. Raspail tells—the complete collapse of Western man even when the very survival of his civilization so clearly hangs in the balance—may seem implausible to some. And yet, what Whites do in *The Camp of the Saints* is no different from what they have done every day for the past forty years. The only difference is that the novel moves in fast forward; it covers in months what could take decades.

Whites all around the world suffer from Mr. Raspail's "monstrous cancer implanted in the Western conscience." South Africans vote for black rule. Americans import millions of non-Whites and grant them racial preferences. Australians abandon their Whites-only immigration policy and become multi-cultural.

White extinction inevitable—or is it? Even if he did not actively cooperate in his own destruction, time works against the White man. As Mr. Raspail writes in the afterward, "the proliferation of other races dooms our race, my race, irretrievably to extinction in the century to come, if we hold fast to our present moral principles. No other race subscribes to these moral principles—if that is really what they are—because they are weapons of self-annihilation."

Mr. Raspail's powerful, gripping novel is a call to all Whites to rekindle their sense of race, love of culture, and pride in history—for he knows that without them we will disappear.

Editor's note

“A Haunting Novel about the End of the White Race” is a 1995 book-review by Taylor of Jean Raspail’s *Camp of the Saints*. Following next are some excerpts from a couple of chapters of Takuan Seiyo’s *From Meccania to Atlantis*.

Seiyo is Jew on his father’s side; Polish, not Japanese, on his mother side, and an anti-Nazi. This said, some passages of his online book are worth reading. Like the text of an ethnic Jew, Lawrence Auster, reproduced way above, instead of mentioning the Jewish problem Seiyo mentions the Muslim problem.

Mugged by reality

by Takuan Seijo★

European Commissioners opine that “Immigration Is Moral Necessity” and “Islam Is Welcome.” A French President predicts that “Arabic Is the Language of the Future.” A Moroccan becomes Mayor of Rotterdam. Europeans who wish to assert their ethnic identity and interests versus those of aliens are roughed up.

In the United States—a country that has ruined itself through its own naïveté about human nature, about the world and about itself, the presidential election is being contested between a right-liberal candidate of the Stupid Party and a left-liberal candidate of the Evil Party. The latter’s position’s is that America’s wealth should be redistributed to the Afro-American “community” so that the country can have its salvation. He may have rephrased this idea in more unctuous words as his political shrewdness was increasing over the years, but essentially this is still the intention.

Soon enough the United States will be turning from a stupid form of capitalism to a stupid form of socialism, and from a stupid form of multiculturalism to an evil one—of the Eurabian kind. It will be Sweden West, without the virtues that ethnic Swedes still possess.

One Identity

We are the ethno-conservatives—perhaps 60 million people in Western Europe, North America and Oceania. There are probably four times that number who are like us, but they are latent, unable at this time to cut through the fog of suppressive propaganda and inertia.

We are vastly outnumbered, and have few friends among the leading elites of the Western world. But it helps to remember that 185 million ex-Russia, non-Muslim Eastern Europeans are behind us. Living under Soviet tyranny has immunized them against the terrible mental virus that has ravaged the West. They have their own problems, related to economic development, but their combined weight is on our side. We ought not to forget who came to the rescue of Vienna and Western civilization in their hopeless encirclement in 1683.

Our common denominator is not white, for our most numerous and powerful opponents are also white. Rather, it is our opposition to our disfranchisement, marginalization and impoverishment by our own ruling elites in government, media, education, culture and business.

In America, we steam for having been abandoned by our government to mayhem and rape by illegal aliens. This is so obvious, that our ruling elites' willful subversion of this precept is the greatest act of mass treason and insanity in the history of the world.

Jihad is an opportunistic infection that lay dormant as long as the West was strong and self-confident. The West's own impairment of its cultural immune functions and the related importation of millions of Muslims has allowed the dormant jihadi virus to thaw and flourish.

We need our particular ethnicity and our singular culture, as other peoples need theirs. In contrast, the ruling American elite—including Republicans—has gone mad to such an extent that “minorities” are now over 1/3 of America's population, soon to be half. And the EU ruling elite is welcoming, nay, soliciting, an Islamic wave that will accomplish what it failed previously at Tours, Lepanto and Vienna.

Together, they have brainwashed two generations of Westerners so effectively that the majority of whites in the world, notably among the young, celebrates “diversity”—i.e. their peoples' and Western Civilization's inevitable dissolution—as their core value. It is against this part of the population, and the politicians and subversive intellectuals who hold their puppet strings, that I believe we ought to define ourselves.

The Pods

Most contemporary whites are docilely or actively complicit in their own displacement, disappropriation, and disproportional share of rape, battery and murder by more savage peoples who have fewer scruples.

That's why I think of them as “Pods” and of us as “Nonpods.” I use these words in the context of one of the great masterpieces of American cinema, *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, released in 1956 and directed by Don Siegel, based on a novel by Jack Finney. In it, a doctor returns to a small California town to find out that one by one, its people, most of whom he has known all his life, have been replaced by doppelgängers. These emotionless beings animated by a single instinct—proliferation—develop from large, foaming seedpods; in effect a biological production line for lifelike automatons, set up by evil space aliens. One by one, real people disappear—acquaintances, friends and ultimately the

protagonist's girlfriend, until he remains the sole nonpod, encircled by human-like, giant legumes: the Body Snatchers.

Pods whose previous identities have been snatched and extinguished seem to be multiplying in our world too, and they are passionate in their hatred—of us. Middle-aged men and women who demonstrate publicly their desire for Europe to remain European are beaten up by Antifa gangs half their age and twenty times their number.

Pods view biological race and gender differences as social constructs, and therefore social group differences as an unjust inequality that must be rectified by reconstructing society. They view nation, ethnoculture, and private property as obsolete obstacles in the way of freedom, equality and fraternity of all people. Therefore, the right of anyone to immigrate anywhere precedes the right of the one suffering the destruction of his social capital by this immigration.

They view the refusal to tolerate the intolerable as unacceptable intolerance, and the desire to protect and preserve one's family, community, country and culture as racism and xenophobia. And lastly, they have stood Jesus' metaphor on its end, so that they fail to see the beam in the nonwhites', non-Christians' eye, but they see and greatly magnify the speck in their own peoples' eye.

This is deep, delusionary dementia. This mental disorder is now the dominant orientation of the Western peoples, with its triumphant apotheosis, The One We Have Been Waiting For, coasting on the final approach to the most powerful job in the world, so that he can change the world into Pod kingdom.

Barack Obama is expected to receive 75-80% of the white vote in many urban areas of the United States. If this is not having one's body and soul snatched, nothing is.

The Pinocchio regime

The grand Body Snatcher project of erasing race-ethnicity-religion-culture-gender distinctions does not, of course, erase them. It merely, in the manner of a babbling baby, starts calling da-da what was previously doo-doo, as if through this onomatopaeic transfiguration shit could be turned into father.

The willful lying about reality, the manipulation of language and images to disguise such lies, the teaching and enforcement of the lies and the persecution of those who challenge the lies is the chief occupation of the regime of Meccania.

Even the few politicians and journalists who take a principled stand against immigration lie. Culture can be reliably correlated with the quartet, and only the full quartet, of race,

ethnicity, religion and social class. But to do that would be to commit the dreaded crime of “discrimination.” In Meccania, one cannot discriminate on pain of severe penalties. But the ultimate peril is to Meccania itself.

Reality will continue to discriminate, no matter what Body Snatchers say or do. And a clash between a reality-averse ideology and Reality has the same pre-ordained outcome as a test crash between a knockoff car and a wall. It’s only a question of the speed, acceleration, mass and distance of the lying car from the solid wall.

The virus is pitiless and catholic, though limited to the (previously) white West alone. In Sweden, there is a plague of rapes committed by Muslim immigrants. As Muslim immigrants in Malmö increased to 25% of the population, the number of rapes tripled. The Rosengård area is largely no-go even for the Swedish police. But the authorities blame the rapes on warm weather, alcohol, Internet dating sites and increase in reporting rape. Fjordman quotes a leading Swedish journalist, Helle Klein, “If the debate is about that there are problems caused by refugees and immigrants, we don’t want it.”

By the time Ms. Klein personally will have already been crash-tested by Reality. Debate will no longer be an option, only submission.

Male-dominated societies like China and Russia aggressively threaten the West’s vital interest, and Islamic patriarchal primitives ravage it from without and within, but the West is busy feminizing itself further, confusing its genders, enforcing gender and race quotas to elevate non-deserving and incompetent nonwhites or non-males, lying to itself outrageously about innate group differences.

$$E = mv^2$$

The energy released by the impact of Snatcher State’s smashup against the Wall of Reality may or may not be expressible in elegant mathematical formulas, but it’s clearly related to the mass hurling forward toward the “progressive” future, times some order of velocity.

The mass is incalculably enormous. Snatcher State now controls every part of every sphere of activity in every Western country. Through Gramscian education, Snatcher State has controlled the brains of the last three generations of its subjects.

The velocity is quite dizzying too. In the Eurabian districts of Meccania, one can compute the approximate date of impact by comparing demographic data on immigration and fertility rates of Muslim immigrants versus those of indigenous Europeans. The meeting with The Wall will occur around mid-21st century. The consequences of the impact are visible now, 40 years in advance.

The crash may take 100 years to unfold fully, just as the test truck folds in slow-motion upon meeting the wall. But its shape is on display in the once-thriving parts of Christian civilization such as North Africa, Syria, Lebanon and Turkey, and in once-peaceful and Buddhist countries like Afghanistan and Pakistan. It's on display now in every country where a minority of another race and faith lives among a Muslim majority.

Detroit has already met The Wall. Its industry is shattered. It looks like a post-Apocalypse city. It has the highest per-capita crime rate in North America, probably in all of Meccania: 1,220 violent crimes per 100,000. 84% of Detroit's population is black, voting strictly by racial allegiance and electing criminal, incompetent mayors and a city council of crude, whitey-bashing ignoramuses.

These problems are impossible to fix, because the ruling Body Snatchers are racist cowards who tacitly hold black (and mestizo) people to lower standards of conduct than they do Whites.

It's more difficult to know what ultimate shape America's Wall will take, for its Snatchers (as in the U.K.) come in three flavors: "Progressive," Liberal and Pseudo-Conservative, whereas in continental Europe they are all from the Left mold. Nevertheless, three things seem solidly in America's future:

One is the destruction of the dollar and of America's capitalist model itself. The second item is the inevitable crash of the global economy. In the West, this will impact the U.S. the most. In either case, Americans will have only their White Pod elite to blame, going back to 1965.

Eurabia will know it has hit The Wall when the *muezzin's* call issues from the tower of the Westerkerk. Europe's secular-socialist feminists will have experienced The Wall when they choose themselves to wear the full body *chador* rather than suffer spontaneous and frequent street violence. The society that swoons at transvestite politicians, gay marriage, homosexual indoctrination in schools and "empowerment" of men-hating Marxist women will know the test of Reality when its fertility rate is no longer 1.3 but 0.65.

Before the impact

The crash seems inevitable. The momentum is enormous. The steering wheel is in the unprisable grip of crash-test dummies. A large majority of the passengers are altered Pods, happy to be on a ride toward a democratic, "progressive" future—peaceful, diverse, integrated, free of discrimination, racism, sexism, homophobia, inequality and all things nasty.

Eventually, when the Wall of Reality is so close, all but the chief priests of the Pod cult will want to bail out from the speeding vehicle. There is nothing like imminent pulverization to reprogram a chip in a hurry. But by then, the velocity will be such that staying or jumping will make no difference.

We might speculate as to the full dimensions of the crash. In areas where the population is less brainwashed, e.g. some parts of the U.S., Australia, Switzerland and Italy, it may avert the crash altogether.

The way to exit the Pod vehicle is to separate from the Body Snatchers. Persuasion, rhetoric, political propaganda, electoral politics cannot do it. A chip that has been molded to oscillate only at one frequency cannot be made to vibrate to another.

Who are the anti-Pods? The “simple folks” who study and work and pay their bills and go through life under their own steam.

It’s people who volunteer for military service rather than attend pacifist demonstrations under a security umbrella provided by the soldiering of others. Who own guns and are ready to defend their families, because they know that Podism breeds crime and the police are always too late. Who marry only those with whom nature has made breeding possible, and who go through the tribulations of raising and providing for their brood. It’s a minority of professionals and intellectuals who had enough inner strength to go through years of Pod indoctrination and peer pressure at university and on the job without losing their hold on Reality’s compass.

Exodus fundamentals

First, singularity. Podism is a single viral pathogen that knows no boundary of territory, culture, language or religion, except it’s limited, as though by a genetic mutation, to people of European origin alone.

Exodus is not simply a flight from high taxes, street crime or ethnic discrimination. When the totem of faked, forced equality hovers like a giant Moloch over Western Civilization, there remains only one option for cultural survival: construct a new civilization—a new civilization that restores and reinvigorates the old one. It will be described hereafter as Atlantis.

Anti-Pods in each town ought to strive to live next to each other, on the same street, in close proximity. When more move in, more contiguous streets. A neighborhood. Anti-Pod café-salons. Anti-Pod clothing stores selling (only high-quality) clothing made by anti-Pods on patterns from the 50s. An anti-Pod radio station and Community-TV channel

and an anti-Pod film theatre running only films free of Snatcher propaganda. Anti-Pod schools and kindergartens.

Right there you see the problem. For Meccania has laws that constrain its citizens' freedom in many of these areas. In Germany, they'll throw you in jail for home-schooling your child. In the U.S., some Snatcher judge will find a way to coerce you to accept Pod residents and employees, and rehab clinics or mosques for Pod clients, and Pod media content, and Pod schooling.

True self-government for anti-Pods will not be possible in any of the major cities of the West—except after the crash. Hence, for anti-Pods for whom it's possible, the goal should be to move away from all centers where Snatchers dominate, to populate villages, towns and provinces that have the fewest Pods and Pod-clients.


The ultimate step would be secession.

Editor's note

“From Meccania to Atlantis” was published in serial form in *The Brussels Journal* from 2008 to 2010. As we will see in the following pages, “snatched” whites have actually been with us throughout the history of the white race.

Titans passages

by Arthur Kemp



Egypt: Same country, different people. Above left: The white pharaoh, Queen Nefertiti, circa 1350 BC. Above center: The effects of racial mixing are clearly to be seen on the face of this coffin portrait of a Roman lady in Hawara, Egypt, 100 AD. Above right: The mixed race Egyptian, Anwar Sadat, president of Egypt in the twentieth century. Nefertiti ruled over an advanced civilization; Sadat ruled over a third world country. The reason for the difference in cultures between Nefertiti's Egypt and Sadat's Egypt was that the Egyptian people had changed.

When reviewing the historical development of all nations, quite often mention is made of a “rise and fall” of a particular civilization. This poses a major question: Why have some civilizations lasted a thousand years or more, while others rise and collapse within a few hundred? Why is it, for example, that nations such as Japan, Sweden, and England—all nations with limited natural resources—could have progressive active cultures for more than one thousand years; whereas mighty civilizations such as Classical Rome, Greece, or Persia, amongst others, collapse after only a few centuries?

Politically correct historians blame the rise and fall of the great nations of the past on politics, economics, morals, lawlessness, debt, environment, and a host of other superficial reasons. However, Japan, England, and Sweden have gone through similar crises scores of times, without those countries falling into decay. It is obvious that there must be some other factor at work—something much more fundamental than just variations in politics, morals, lawlessness, or any of the other hundreds of reasons that historians have manufactured in their attempts to explain the collapse of civilizations.

Originally created by Proto-Nordics, Alpines, and Mediterraneans, and then influenced by waves of Indo-European invaders, the white civilizations in the Middle East all flourished, producing the wonders of the ancient world. These regions were either invaded or otherwise occupied (through the use of laborers, immigration, or in rare cases, by conquest) by nonwhite nations of varying races. When the original white peoples who created those civilizations vanished or became an insignificant minority (through death and absorption into other races), their civilizations “fell” in exactly the same way that the Amerind civilization in North America “fell.”

500 BC—First Turning Point. It was around the year 500 BC that the first great turning point in white history was reached. This was the decline of the first great white civilizations in the Middle East and their subsequent replacement by nations and peoples of a substantially different racial makeup.

Up until this time the development of the white race’s territorial expansion was such that they were a majority in Europe and all of Russia west of the Urals. They formed a significant component of the population of the Middle East and their rule extended into the Indus River Valley in Northern India.

In India, the invading Indo-Aryans established a strict segregation system to keep themselves separate from the local dark skinned native population. This system was so strict that it has lasted to this day and has become known as the caste system.

However, even the strictest segregation (and Aryan laws prescribing punishments such as death for miscegenation) did not prevent the majority population from eventually swallowing up the ruling Aryans until the situation has been reached today where only a very few high caste Brahmin Indians could still pass as Europeans.

Exactly the same thing happened in Central Asia, Egypt, Sumeria, and to a lesser degree, modern Turkey. Slowly but surely, as these civilizations relied more and more on others to do their work for them, or were physically conquered by other races, their population makeup became darker and darker.

Miscegenation with Nonwhite Slaves Caused Egyptian Decline. From the time of the Old Kingdom, the original white Egyptians had been using Nubians, blacks, and Semites (or Arabs) to work on many of their building projects or as general slaves.

At various stages the pharaohs also employed Nubian mercenaries, and ultimately Nubia and Sudan were physically occupied and incorporated into the Egyptian empire. Although the buildings of ancient Egypt are very impressive—many having survived through to the present day, their construction was dependent on the Egyptian ability to organize an unprecedented mass of human labor.

Several attempts were made to prevent large numbers of Nubians from settling in Egypt. One of the first recorded racial separation laws was inscribed on a stone on the banks of the southern Nile which forbade Nubians from proceeding north of that point. Nonetheless, the continuous use of Nubians for labor eventually led to the establishment of a large resident nonwhite population in Egypt, with their numbers being augmented by natural reproduction and continued immigration.

The region was also occupied for two hundred years by the Semitic Hyksos, who intermarried with the local population, and this was followed by other Semitic/Arabic immigration, fueled by the long existing black settlement on the southernmost reaches of the Nile River.

Once again the factors which led to the extinction of the Aryans in India came into play in Egypt: a resident nonwhite population to do the labor, a natural increase in nonwhite numbers, physical integration, and a decline in the original white birthrate. All these factors compounded to produce an Egyptian population makeup of today that is very different from the men and women who founded Egypt and designed the pyramids.

As the population makeup shifted, so the cultural manifestations, or civilization, of that region changed to the point where the present day population of the Middle East is not by any stretch of the imagination classifiable as white. The Egyptians of today are a completely different people, racially and culturally, living amongst the ruins of another race's civilization.

Identical Reasons for Decline in Middle East. The decline and eventual extinction of the white population in the Middle East marked the end of the original civilizations in those regions. In all the Middle Eastern countries the Semitic (Arabic) and black populations grew as they were used as labor by the ruling whites. In the case of Sumer, the white rulers were physically displaced by military conquest at the hands of Semitic invaders.

This process continued until almost all remains of the original whites in the greater region were assimilated into the darker populations. Only the occasional appearance of light

colored hair or eyes amongst today's Iraqis, Iranians, Syrians, and Palestinians serve as reminders of the original rulers of these territories.

Lesson—Role of Racially Foreign Labor in the Decline of a Civilization. The lesson is clear: a civilization will remain intact as long as its creating race remains in existence. This applies to all races equally—white, black, Mongolian or any other. As long as a civilization's founding race maintains its territorial integrity and does not use large numbers of any other alien race to do its labor, that civilization will remain in existence.

If a civilization allows large numbers of racial aliens into its midst (most often as laborers) and then integrates with those newcomers, that civilization will change to reflect the new racial makeup of the population.

Any civilization—be it white, black, Asian, or aboriginal—stands or falls by the homogeneity of its population, and nothing else. As soon as a society loses its homogeneity, the nature of that society changes. This simple fact, often ignored by historians, provides the key to understanding the rise and fall of all civilizations.

History Is a Function of Race. The early white civilizations in Greece and Rome also fell to this process. The last great Grecian leader, Pericles, actually enacted a law in the year 451 BC limiting citizenship of the state according to racial descent. However, some four hundred years later this law was changed as the population shifts had become more and more evident. Certain Roman leaders tried to turn back the racial clock, but their efforts were in vain. The sheer vastness of the Roman Empire meant that all sorts of races were included in its borders, and this brew ultimately led to the dissolution of the original Roman population.

Those who occupy a territory determine the nature of the society in that territory. This is an immutable law of nature. It is the iron rule upon which all of human endeavour is built—that history is a function of race.

The Reign of Terror—Nordics Targeted

The French Revolution soon took a sub-racial undertone—often it was enough to have blond hair to be declared a noble and be beheaded. This was taken to an extreme under a bloodthirsty period known as the “reign of terror” and led to civil and foreign wars for ten years.

During this period, revolutionary tribunals and commissions beheaded close on 17,000 people—when the numbers of Frenchmen who died in prison or who were shot out of hand is added in, the victims of the Reign of Terror totaled approximately 40,000.

Of those executed, approximately 8 percent were nobles, 6 percent were members of the clergy, 14 percent belonged to the middle class, and 70 percent were workers or peasants charged with draft dodging, desertion, hoarding, rebellion, and various other “anti-revolutionary” crimes.


One step taken by the new French Republic was the official emancipation of the French Jews, and for the first time they were allowed to participate fully in public office in France. For this reason French and European Jewry became outspoken supporters of the revolution.

Striving to establish a “Republic of Virtue,” the leaders of the revolution stressed devotion to the republic and instituted measures against corruption and hoarding—two trademarks of the Church. This led directly to the November 1793 closing of all churches in the Commune of Paris, a measure soon copied by authorities elsewhere in France. A non-Christian cult was established, known as the Cult of Reason, with its main center being the then desanctified Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris.

Although the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars did not result in the importation of any large numbers of non-Whites into France, huge numbers of White Frenchmen, both nobles and commoners, lost their lives in the period from 1789 to 1815, with the Napoleonic Wars alone resulting in the deaths of over a million White Frenchmen—a huge slice of the population at that time, possibly as much as 35 per cent of all able bodied Frenchmen of all ages. The French Revolution itself had dealt a serious blow to the Nordic element of French society, as Nordic features were associated with nobility and made immediate targets for the revolutionary mobs. This led to a denordicization of the French population which is still evident today in the relatively small number of blonds amongst the modern French population.

The French Revolution of 1789 was to serve as the spark to Saint-Domingue’s population pressures. A decree by the new French national assembly in Paris of 15 May 1791, gave the right to vote for a government in Saint-Domingue to the White and mixed race population on the island.

The White settlers on the island immediately protested, with the governor general of the island, the aptly named Blanchelande, sending a message to Paris warning that the implementation of such a form of government would result in “a frightful civil war” and the loss of the colony for France.



The French National Assembly then rescinded the earlier decree, issuing a new one saying that the colonists themselves could decide on what form of government was best for their own particular circumstances. When this news was made known in Saint-Domingue, it heightened tensions: the mixed race population reacted very badly to being told they had the vote one week and then being denied it a few weeks later. Racial tension began to build up.

One of the results of the French Revolution was the creation of a political lobby in the National Assembly known as the Friends of the Blacks (*Amis des Noirs*). The *Amis des Noirs* reacted with outrage to the second decree on Saint-Domingue, and applied sufficient pressure in the French National Assembly to not only have the second decree withdrawn, but to have a new one put in its place which gave the vote to not only the mixed race population of Saint-Domingue but also to all Blacks who were not under any form of indentured labor—that is, to the free Blacks as well.

When this news was received in Saint-Domingue, the Black population, which had somehow managed to seize a shipment of weapons, went over to a fully-fledged race war, attacking Whites, burning plantations and plunging the island into chaos. The mixed race population first sided with the Whites, then with the Blacks, only to ultimately find that neither side accepted them.

This chaos continued until 1802, when a detachment of 20,000 White French troops sent by Napoleon Bonaparte to restore order to the island, landed and crushed the long boiling race war. Black insurgents were hunted down and the leaders of the Black rebellion surrendered, pledging allegiance to the new French government.

Then in 1802, yellow fever broke out amongst the French troops, at one stage killing as many as 160 per day. By 6 August 1802, four fifths of the French troops who had arrived earlier in the year, were dead from the disease. Napoleon sent 10,000 fresh troops to bolster the beleaguered French garrison. The Blacks, seeing the ravages of the disease

amongst the White troops (the Blacks were largely immune to it) relaunched their racial rebellion, and the security situation on the island had once again descended into near anarchy, with Whites and mixed race persons being targeted at random by Black rebels.

The conflict then took a nasty turn: the French troops decided that the only way to bring the now twelve year-old race war to an end, was to kill all Black inhabitants over the age of twelve years—since they reasoned that any adult Black who for the previous twelve years of the conflict had been a rebel waging racial war against the Whites, would never again meekly go back to working in the fields and would be, forever, a potential rebel and insurgent. The same applied to Black women, the French decided, as the female Blacks had proved themselves to be even more vicious and cruel to captured Whites than what the men had been.

With ruthless energy, the new French troops pursued this task, and many Blacks were indeed killed in this arbitrary fashion. It was however not a one-way affair: both sides reacted to each others' atrocities by committing even greater ones: the murderous situation escalated exponentially.

Then the Napoleonic Wars intervened: with France being at war with Britain, the French colonial possession came under attack from the British navy. The English fleet blockaded the island, not only cutting off supplies to the French garrison from France, but also aiding the Black rebels on the island with supplies of guns and ammunition.

The new Black rebel leader, one Dessalines, led a number of vicious attacks on isolated French garrisons on some coastal towns, during which all the White inhabitants were put to death. By 10 November 1803, the French could no longer hold out, and surrendered to the English Fleet off the coast. Of the 50,000 French troops sent to island, only a few thousand ever made it back to France—and this loss was to sorely count against Napoleon at later battles in Europe itself.

With the surrender of the French, the Black rebel leader Dessalines immediately set about slaughtering those Whites unfortunate enough not to have left the island. Saint-Domingue was renamed Haiti in December 1803 and declared a republic—the second in the Western Hemisphere after the United States of America and the first independent Black ruled nation in the Caribbean.

Having disposed of the Whites on the island, the Blacks and mixed-race population then turned on each other in yet another race war, ending with the virtual annihilation of the mixed race peoples. In October 1804, Dessalines declared his people to be the winners and to mark the occasion, declared himself emperor for life of Haiti.

The same year, Dessalines issued an invitation to the Whites who had left the island, to return and help rebuild the economy, which had been utterly destroyed as a result of the

thirteen years of race war. A surprisingly large number of Whites took up his offer, but soon discovered, to their cost, the nature of their error.

Scarcely had the new year, 1805, begun when the Black population once again rose up against the Whites, although this time there was no reason to do so apart from sheer racial hatred. The handful of Whites appealed to the emperor, but he was powerless to control the mobs: Whites were slaughtered if they were found.

Finally on 18 March 1805, the very last White man, woman and child on Haiti was killed. The Black rebels had for the second time succeeded in killing or driving out every single White on the island.

Editor's note. After explaining how the Second Republic's constitution created a presidential republic with a parliament elected by universal male suffrage—one of the greatest blunders that with time would provoke the suffrage for women and non-whites—, Kemp writes:

By 1919, the French population had been battered by more than two centuries of major wars, and had started to go into a serious decline. The French government then started allowing French speaking Black Africans and non-White Algerians into France, mainly for use as labor, but also as army troops, in order to make up population shortfalls. In this way the German territory of the Rhineland was occupied by Black French troops, creating much anger amongst the Germans and becoming a political issue in the latter country.



French women with non-white blood

According to official French statistics, some three million North African Arabic mixed race and African Blacks, all from the French colonies, immigrated into France itself during the period 1919 to 1927. (This figure is probably an underestimation, as it does not take into account illegal immigration, which probably accounted for a least half a million more).

Although the majority of Frenchmen did not integrate with this non-White influx, a significant minority did, creating the inappropriately named “Mediterranean” look associated with the French in certain areas. This integration process did not however reach anywhere near the level of the Spanish, and was certainly nowhere near the Portuguese example. Nonetheless, it is possible to see the traces of the large Black influx in a minority of modern Frenchmen to this day.

The American Civil War

When Abraham Lincoln uttered the words “our White men are cutting one another’s throats” to a deputation of Blacks at the seat of government in Washington D.C. in 1862, not even he could have foreseen the slaughter that would take place over the next three years in his country: more Americans were to die in that Civil War than what were ever to be killed in any war before or ever since.

Once the Union had been established, it faced two critical issues: whether the United States of America should be a federation or a confederation; and whether the institution of indentured labor—in effect a lighter form of slavery—should be allowed to continue or not.

Together these two issues led to the American Civil War, which can be counted as one of the great turning points in American history: it set the new nation against itself, the South, supporting confederalism and indentured labor; against the North, who favored federalism and the abolition of slavery. Great White armies fought each other and finally decimated the South, all in an argument over the future of the Black race.

Before the Civil War, Blacks were not allowed to join state militias or the U.S. Army or Navy, and the federal government refused to give passports to free Blacks. This status had been confirmed by the US Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case of 1857, when it had ruled that Blacks could never be citizens of the United States.

When the Civil War started, the Northern government initially refused to allow Blacks to be enlisted into the army. By 1862, the rules had been changed slightly: Blacks were allowed to enlist in segregated units, led by White officers. By the end of the war, more than 200,000 Blacks had served in the Northern Army and Navy.

The North and the South had differing aims in the war, which were to determine their strategies: the South only wanted to maintain its independence; while the North wanted to suppress the secession. This meant that the North would have to invade the South: this

led to the North being the offensive power in the war, with the South being the defensive power.

Lincoln indeed had suspended many of the tenements of democracy: critics of the war were arrested and detained without trial for long periods. The most famous example was an anti-war congressman from Ohio, Clement L. Vallandigham, who was arrested in May 1863 after making an anti-war speech. A military court sentenced him to prison, but Lincoln changed the penalty to banishment to the Confederacy.

Then on 1 June 1863, Lincoln suspended the principle of freedom of speech—a right guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution—by banning publication of the *Chicago Times*, which had become increasingly anti-Lincoln. An uproar followed, and Lincoln was forced to back down on the issue.

* * *

The march north—led again by general William Tecumseh Sherman—again left a deliberate wake of destruction in its path. Once supplies had been seized, it was the norm for houses and farms to be destroyed, and then the White population to be left to the mercies of the freed Black slaves.

As a result of this scorched earth policy, Sherman's name came to be hated in the South, and with good reason. Fifteen towns were burned in whole or in part, but no act of destruction compared with or caused more controversy than the burning of Columbia, the state capital of South Carolina, which saw the city utterly destroyed for no military purpose at all.



The Burning of Columbia, South Carolina (1865) by William Waud

On 17 April, the last Confederate forces surrendered in Durham Station, North Carolina, with the last two sizeable Confederate armies, one in Louisiana and the other in Texas, both surrendering in May 1865, realizing that the war was lost and that it was pointless to fight on. Finally the president of the Confederation, Jefferson Davis, was taken prisoner in Georgia on 10 May. The war was over.

The US Congress, now totally dominated by anti-slavery activists who wanted revenge on the South for not only the practice of slavery but also for seceding from the Union, passed a series of laws designed to bring the South firmly under control.

Then the Constitution of the Union was amended (the third section of the 14th Amendment, ratified on 9 July 1868) through which massive numbers of Southern Whites were disenfranchised because they had rebelled against the Union. At the same time full voting rights were extended to all the now emancipated slaves; the classification of Blacks as “three fifths of a person” clause in the Constitution was revoked by this amendment (although the Amerinds were still specifically excluded from the franchise).

The resulting administrations in the South provoked great resentment, and stoked the fires of racial conflict. Large numbers of Whites were barred from voting, and the legislatures of the Southern states were in many cases dominated by illiterate Black former slaves who suddenly found themselves propelled from picking cotton into running the affairs of state. They were of course incapable of running the government efficiently, and the organs of government began to deteriorate almost immediately, with orderly government breaking down in many areas.

Former Black slaves were also placed in many areas as soldiers and officers enforcing law and order over the defeated Southern Whites. This provided plenty of opportunities for revenge and abuse. In addition to the appointment of hopelessly incompetent Blacks to fill the positions of government, unscrupulous Northerners also took up positions in the Southern government, often merely to embezzle funds and enrich themselves: they became known as *carpetbaggers*. Northern civil war veterans were put on the official state payroll; Southern veterans were consistently denied any form of pension.

Finally in 1871, the American president of the time, Ulysses S. Grant, largely in reaction to Southern White complaints that they were disenfranchised while illiterate Blacks were granted the vote, assented to a further change to the U.S. Constitution guaranteeing the rights of all citizens.

By 1871, with Whites having been given back the vote, they once again formed the majority of voters in the South.

The Southern Democratic legislatures then enacted a series of segregation laws designed to separate the races in all aspects, from schools through to public places. Many of these

measures were in due course to spread to the north of the country a well. In 1875, the US Congress passed a Civil Rights Act, which barred discrimination by hotels, theatres, and railways. In 1883, this act was declared unconstitutional on the grounds that it interfered with the right of control-of-access to private property.

Racial consequences of the war. The after effects of the war on America's White population was vast. At least 250,000 Confederate White soldiers were killed—five per cent of the South's White population. Vast areas of farmland were devastated, and many great cities, like Atlanta, were virtually leveled to the ground.

The South's four million Blacks took advantage of the chaos to seize as much property as was remaining, with their claims often being legitimized by the Black dominated Reconstruction governments.

The Civil War severely dented the White population in America: a total of 610,000 Whites were killed—compared to the 4,435 who died during the War of Independence. These figures included 360,000 on the Northern side and 250,000 on the Southern side. Although the North lost more men, that region had a greater White population of some 22 million. The South, however, had a population of only some 8 million whites. In percentage terms then, the war was far more devastating to the South than to the North.

Mass immigration into our heartlands

The dominating theme of European history in the last quarter of the 20th Century has been the large-scale immigration of non-White peoples and races into the modern era White heartlands of Europe, Australia/New Zealand and North America. This process has taken place via two avenues: legal immigration and illegal immigration: it is difficult to formulate estimates on which has been the greater. Whatever the channel used, the reality of masses of non-Whites settling in these territories can quite rightly said to be changing the face of these continents.

According to Eurostat (the Statistical Office of the European Communities) in their publication *Migration Statistics, 1996*, there is not one of the fifteen countries in Western Europe which, at the beginning of 1994, did not have less than 3-10 per cent of what they euphemistically call “non-nationals resident.”

France, Germany, Austria, the Benelux countries, Denmark, Scandinavia and England are all listed as having “non-nationals resident” of more than 10 per cent, with Germany in

two regions registered figures of “more than 15 per cent.” An average of between ten and fifteen per cent of “non nationals resident” in Western Europe as of the mid 1990’s is therefore an accurate estimate, given that official figures are always behind actual statistics, as the number of illegal immigrants always closely shadows the number of legal immigrants.

Racial mixing has been extremely prevalent in Britain. According to the 1991 census, taken by the Office for National Statistics in London (ONS), 40 per cent of young Black men in Britain are married to, or live with, a White partner (the trend is less common on the other side of the sexual divide). Britain has, as a result of this large non-White influx, suffered a large number of Black riots, the most serious of which occurred in 1981, when countrywide riots saw large areas of many inner cities razed to the ground.

According to an article in the newspaper, *USA Today* of 17 June 1998, the number of mixed-race marriages in the USA was 150,000 in 1960. By 1998 it had increased to “over 1.5 million” and it estimated that the number of mixed-race children in America stood at “over 2 million.”

The 1960s will also go down in history as having introduced one of the most significant factors to affect White numbers in the entire history of the world: the development of the birth control pill, or oral contraceptive, which was first approved for use in the United States in 1965. Social demographic trends have shown that it is only in the Western, White, industrialized countries where contraception is used to any significant degree.

The reproduction rate in White countries (amongst their native populations) has, since the introduction of the pill, dropped to the point where in most White countries it is below the stable replacement rate of 2.4 children per female. In the non-White Third World however, no such restraints exist, and the population grows exponentially as fast as the White population declines in Europe and North America: this demographic time bomb will in the not to distant future have serious consequences for the entire earth.

The resultant massive overpopulation of the non-White lands of the earth provides the major driver for non-White immigration into the White heartlands of Europe, Australia and North America.

Excerpted from several chapters of *March of the Titans* (op. cit.).

The next pages reproduce a passage from Will Durant’s *The Story of Philosophy*. Although Durant was almost the opposite of a racist historian like Arthur Kemp, what he says at the beginning of the chapter “From Aristotle to the Renaissance” is germane. The title chosen for the next article is our own.

Alexander the “great”

by Will Durant

Sparta blockaded and defeated Athens towards the close of the fifth century b. c, political supremacy passed from the mother of Greek philosophy and art, and the vigor and independence of the Athenian mind decayed.

When, in 399 b. c, Socrates was put to death, the soul of Athens died with him, lingering only in his proud pupil, Plato. And when Philip of Macedon defeated the Athenians at Chaeronea in 338 b. c, and Alexander burned the great city of Thebes to the ground three years later, even the ostentatious sparing of Pindar's home could not cover up the fact that Athenian independence, in government and in thought, was irrevocably destroyed.

The domination of Greek philosophy by the Macedonian Aristotle mirrored the political subjection of Greece by the virile and younger peoples of the north. The death of Alexander (323 b. c.) quickened this process of decay. The boy-emperor, barbarian though he remained after all of Aristotle's tutoring, had yet learned to revere the rich culture of Greece, and had dreamed of spreading that culture through the Orient in the wake of his victorious armies. The development of Greek commerce, and the multiplication of Greek trading posts throughout Asia Minor, had provided an economic basis for the unification of this region as part of an Hellenic empire; and Alexander hoped that from these busy stations Greek thought, as well as Greek goods, would radiate and conquer.

But he had underrated the inertia and resistance of the Oriental mind, and the mass and depth of Oriental culture. It was only a youthful fancy, after all, to suppose that so immature and unstable a civilization as that of Greece could be imposed upon a civilization immeasurably more widespread, and rooted in the most venerable traditions.

The quantity of Asia proved too much for the quality of Greece. Alexander himself, in the hour of his triumph, was conquered by the soul of the East; he married (among several ladies) the daughter of Darius; he adopted the Persian diadem and robe of state; he introduced into Europe the Oriental notion of the divine right of kings; and at last he

astonished a sceptic Greece by announcing, in magnificent Eastern style, that he was a god. Greece laughed; and Alexander drank himself to death.

This subtle infusion of an Asiatic soul into the wearied body of the master Greek was followed rapidly by the pouring of Oriental cults and faiths into Greece along those very lines of communication which the young conqueror had opened up; the broken dykes let in the ocean of Eastern thought upon the lowlands of the still adolescent European mind. The mystic and superstitious faiths which had taken root among the poorer people of Hellas were reinforced and spread about; and the Oriental spirit of apathy and resignation found a ready soil in decadent and despondent Greece.

The introduction of the Stoic philosophy into Athens by the Phoenician merchant Zeno (about 310 b. c.) was but one of a multitude of Oriental infiltrations. Both Stoicism and Epicureanism—the apathetic acceptance of defeat, and the effort to forget defeat in the arms of pleasure—were theories as to how one might yet be happy though subjugated or enslaved; precisely as the pessimistic Oriental stoicism of Schopenhauer and the despondent epicureanism of Renan were in the nineteenth century the symbols of a shattered Revolution and a broken France. Not that these natural antitheses of ethical theory were quite new to Greece. One finds them in the gloomy Heraclitus and the “laughing philosopher” Democritus; and one sees the pupils of Socrates dividing into Cynics and Cyrenaics under the lead of Antisthenes and Aristippus, and extolling, the one school apathy, the other happiness.

Yet these were even then almost exotic modes of thought: imperial Athens did not take to them. But when Greece had seen Chaeronea in blood and Thebes in ashes, it listened to Diogenes; and when the glory had departed from Athens she was ripe for Zeno and Epicurus.

Zeno built his philosophy of *apatheia* on a determinism which a later Stoic, Chrysippus, found it hard to distinguish from Oriental fatalism. As Schopenhauer deemed it useless for the individual will to fight the universal will, so the Stoic argued that philosophic indifference was the only reasonable attitude to a life in which the struggle for existence is so unfairly doomed to inevitable defeat. If victory is quite impossible it should be scorned. The secret of peace is not to make our achievements equal to our desires, but to lower our desires to the level of our achievements. “If what you have seems insufficient to you,” said the Roman Stoic Seneca (d. 65 a. d.), “then, though you possess the world, you will yet be miserable.” Such a principle cried out to heaven for its opposite, and Epicurus, though himself as Stoic in life as Zeno, supplied it. Epicurus, says Fenelon, “bought a fair garden, which he tilled himself. There it was he set up his school, and there he lived a gentle and agreeable life with his disciples, whom he taught as he walked and worked. He was gentle and affable to all men. He held there was nothing nobler than to apply one’s self to philosophy. His starting point of conviction that apathy is impossible, and that pleasure—

though not necessarily sensual pleasure—is the only conceivable, and quite legitimate, end of life and action.

Epicurus, then, is no epicurean; he exalts the joys of intellect rather than those of sense; he warns against pleasures that excite and disturb the soul which they should rather quiet and appease. In the end he proposes to seek not pleasure in its usual sense, but *ataraxia*—tranquillity, equanimity, repose of mind; all of which trembles on the verge of Zeno’s “apathy.”

The Romans, coming to despoil Hellas in 146 b. c, found these rival schools dividing the philosophic field; and having neither leisure nor subtlety for speculation themselves, brought back these philosophies with their other spoils to Rome. Great organizers, as much as inevitable slaves, tend to stoic moods: it is difficult to be either master or servant if one is sensitive. So such philosophy as Rome had was mostly of Zeno’s school, whether in Marcus Aurelius the emperor or in Epictetus the slave; and even Lucretius talked epicureanism stoically (like Heine’s *Englishman* taking his pleasures sadly), and concluded his stern gospel of pleasure by committing suicide. His noble epic *On the Nature of Things* follows Epicurus in damning pleasure with faint praise.

Nations, too, like individuals, slowly grow and surely die. In the face of warfare and inevitable death, there is no wisdom but in *ataraxia*, —“to look on all things with a mind at peace.” Here, clearly, the old pagan joy of life is gone, and an almost exotic spirit touches a broken lyre.

Imagine the exhilarating optimism of explicit Stoics like Aurelius or Epictetus. Nothing in all literature is so depressing as the *Dissertations of the Slave*, unless it be the *Meditations* of the emperor. “Seek not to have things happen as you choose them, but rather choose that they should happen as they do; and you shall live prosperously.” No doubt one can in this manner dictate the future, and play royal highness to the universe.

Story has it that Epictetus’ master, who treated him with consistent cruelty, one day took to twisting Epictetus’ leg to pass the time away. “If you go on,” said Epictetus calmly, “you will break my leg.” The master went on, and the leg was broken. “Did I not tell you,” Epictetus observed mildly, “that you would break my leg?” Yet there is a certain mystic nobility in this philosophy, as in the quiet courage of some Dostoevskian pacifist. “Never in any case say, I have lost such a thing; but, I have returned it. Is thy child dead?—it is returned. Is thy wife dead?—she is returned. Art thou deprived of thy estate?—is not this also returned?”

In such passages we feel the proximity of Christianity and its dauntless martyrs. In Epictetus the Greco-Roman soul has lost its paganism, and is ready for a new faith. His book had the distinction of being adopted as a religious manual by the early Christian

Church. From these *Dissertations* and Aurelius' *Meditations* there is but a step to *The Imitation of Christ*...

The wealth of Rome passed into poverty, the organization into disintegration, the power and pride into decadence and apathy. Cities faded back into the undistinguished hinterland; the roads fell into disrepair and no longer hummed with trade; the small families of the educated Romans were outbred by the vigorous and untutored German stocks that crept, year after year, across the frontier; pagan culture yielded to Oriental cults; and almost imperceptibly the Empire passed into the Papacy.

The Story of Philosophy: the Lives and Opinions of the Greater Philosophers (1926).

White pathology

by Kevin MacDonald



This is an introduction to special sections in the Summer and Fall issues of *The Occidental Quarterly* (TOQ) focused on White pathology. Whatever blame for our situation that we place on others, the bottom line is that we are allowing the unfolding disaster to happen. It is unprecedented for a civilization to voluntarily cede political and cultural hegemony to others, particularly when so many of these people harbor hatreds and resentments toward our people and our culture.

Before I get to the special sections, I want to highlight another recent paper. Ricardo Duchesne, a professor of sociology at the University of New Brunswick and no stranger to these pages, has an article in the Fall issue on historians who are falsifying history in order to make it more amenable to their multicultural, anti-Western agenda. His title says it all: “Multicultural Historians: The Assault on Western Civilization and Defilement of the Historical Profession.” As we are all aware, the academic world has become a seething cauldron of anti-White sentiment, and right now World History is Exhibit A. It is particularly important that he is writing under his own name. All good writing is important, but in the long run it’s critical to have people who are out there in the open and willing to take the heat.

The purpose of TOQ is to develop an alternative intellectual universe in opposition to the current dispensation. With the addition of Prof. Duchesne and some of the other writers I will mention (the Summer and Fall issues also have excellent articles by F. Roger Devlin,

Andrew Fraser, Nelson Rosit, and Jared Taylor), we are well on the way to achieving a critical mass of smart, well-informed writers able to mount an intellectually rigorous, honest critique of the current multicultural zeitgeist—indeed, the emerging multicultural police state.

Also in the Fall issue, Alex Kurtagic focuses on the antifa which he portrays correctly as a violence-prone, completely irrational, anti-intellectual movement. He writes:

it is not interested in thought, but in the physical prevention of thought. Indeed, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the Left anarchist ideology permeating the movement serves as little more than a moral justification for engaging in the simple animal pleasures of physical violence—for venting pent-up anger and frustration, arising from feelings of envy, inadequacy, and inferiority.

This seems logical, for antifa militants are failures in life, with little or nothing to lose except through another's loss of what has been denied to them. Beneath the platitudes hides the desire of a talentless nobody to lash out against a society that has otherwise relegated him to powerless anonymity.

Another paper in the Fall issue, by K. Friedrich Amelang, discusses an anxiety disorder he labels “the White disease,” “a common malady in the American workplace. Its pathology—that is, its causes, development, and its consequences—are rooted in irrational, illogical beliefs about racial equality.” Based on his experiences working with White employees, his essay outlines remedial techniques aimed at countering White guilt, self-abasement, and irrational beliefs about racial equality that are so common these days (e.g., “Whites must understand that the emotional disturbances suffered by minorities are not their own fault, but rather the result of external causes [like White oppression].”).

Writing in the Summer issue, Robert S. Griffin, professor of education at the University of Vermont, points out that Whites are not behaving pathologically given the present system of rewards and punishments. He begins with the fact that the contemporary world has been constructed so that Whites who participate in the destruction of the West are often handsomely rewarded for doing so and punished for dissenting from the anti-White zeitgeist. They have also been propagandized from an early age that identifying as a White and believing that Whites have interests as a group are signs of psychopathology. Their behavior is thus self-interested, even if short-sighted. Of course, ultimately this state of affairs must be attributed to the triumph of a new elite hostile to the traditional people and culture of the West.

Yet another aspect of White pathology is the failure of elites to have a sense of loyalty and commitment to other Whites. In the Fall issue, John Gardner (“Yggdrasil”) notes of the period from the 16th to the 18th century in England:

The key point here is that the vast majority of Englishmen at the time were slaves in all but name, but since they were not chattel property, no one was bound by law or resale value to take reasonable care of them. Say what you like about the evils of slavery, as chattel property, slaves had a place and a value in society. In effect, the majority of “free” Englishmen at the time were an alien race with no place or value in society and no rights whatsoever.

The small minority in control feared and hated them, to a much greater degree than modern White liberals despise hillbillies, and sought to expel them to distant colonies as a means of suppressing future rebellions.

But there was a major shift beginning in the 18th century that led to the destruction of that world but which has led to another aspect of White pathology—pathological altruism. In the Summer issue there are three papers on this topic, leading off with Jared Taylor’s very incisive review of a collection of academic papers on pathological altruism.

Pathological altruism (PA) is generally defined as a sincere attempt to help others that instead harms others or oneself—“an unhealthy focus on others to the detriment of one’s own needs.” PA is likely when people “falsely believe that they caused the other’s problems, or falsely believe that they have the means to relieve the person of suffering.” Or, it is “the false belief that one’s own success, happiness, or well-being is a source of unhappiness for others.” PA “often involves self-righteousness,” and can result in “impulsive and ineffective efforts to equalize or level the playing field.”

Together, these definitions are an almost perfect description of White liberal attitudes towards non-Whites.

Pathological altruism has a strong emotional core based feelings of empathy and righteousness. The sensations of rightness and nobility are so pleasurable that people are inclined to seek them in their own right and without regard to facts or consequences.

When mother nature wants you to do something, it makes it pleasurable. Taylor points out that “This is the kind of conviction that can lead to acts of altruism that are clearly pathological. At the same time, whether these authors know it or not, they have provided a strikingly vivid portrait of mental state of anti-racism and of the motives that drive it. In the West, there is nothing that offers more ecstatic self-righteousness than denouncing ‘racism.’”

It’s noteworthy that one of the authors points out that only Europeans have decided “to elevate altruism above other culturally promoted ideals, such as tribal patriotism and glory-at-arms, which our ancestors considered paramount.” They have gone even further, extending tribal altruism to the entire world, although “some other cultures consider this Western quality to border on madness.”

Taylor comments: “Of course, it is madness, but Europeans who point this out are punished.”

Another very valuable member of the *TOQ* brain trust is Andrew Joyce. He is a particularly talented young writer who has been a regular contributor. Joyce’s article in the White pathology issue discusses the Morant Bay rebellion of 1861 in Jamaica. This was a horrifically violent episode, with gruesome, extremely painful murders motivated by hatred of Whites. The town of Bowden was plundered, and the island curate “had his tongue cut out while he was still alive, an attempt is said to have been made to skin him.” Another individual “was ripped open and had his entrails taken out.” Others were “roasted alive” and “had their eyeballs scooped out.” According to the *London Times*, the mob then indulged in alcoholic excess, harboring the “drunken dream of negro mastery and white slavery. It was Africa, hitherto dormant, that had broken out in their natures. They desired the extermination of their emancipators.” Joyce comments:

To the clear-thinking individual, it was a plainly criminal, and unimaginably brutal series of actions, carried out for malicious reasons against a population targeted for being White. And yet, there was a liberal faction in England convinced not only that it was the Black population that were the true victims, but also that their fellow Whites were reprehensible monsters who deserved the fate which befell them. This pathological response, laden with a misplaced hyper-emotionality, would shake the Empire to its core, sapping its confidence, and bequeathing a legacy which is still felt to this day.

The main warriors on behalf of the Blacks were “Christian philanthropists who believed that these races could be raised to standards of education and conduct which would place them alongside Europeans. Members of this group tended to be Non-Conformist, middle-class, and liberal or radical in their politics.” Crucially, most had never travelled outside Britain, and had little or no experience with the races they so emphatically and persistently eulogized.

The movement was centered around Exeter Hall, a residence in London. The term “Exeter Hall” became synonymous with what Charles Dickens described as “platform sympathy for the Black and platform indifference to our own countrymen.”

Dickens wrote:

The Jamaica insurrection is another hopeful piece of business. That platform sympathy with the Black—or the Native, or the Devil—afar off, and that platform indifference to our own countrymen at enormous odds in the midst of bloodshed and savagery makes me stark wild.

The indifference of these universalist elites to the plight of the working classes of their own people is striking, and highly reminiscent of what we see today. It’s also hard to

explain simply by invoking empathy on steroids. These people have empathy, but not for anyone that looks like himself.

Exeter Hall was largely responsible for the production and dissemination of a range of anti-slavery and pro-Black propaganda which, with its heady emotional characteristics, thrived on those under the influence of the Romantic movement. It was of course highly idealistic:

There was also significant involvement in the movement from the Protestant churches. It was the religious arm of Exeter Hall which was responsible for sending mission upon mission to the colonies with the aim of not only saving souls but of “regenerating whole races,” and it was this religious arm, in conjunction with the mainstream propaganda effort, which popularized the idea of the “noble savage” among the congregations of Britain’s churches.

The idea that Whites, particularly Anglo-Saxons, had a divinely ordained mission to raise up the backward peoples of the earth was driven by Exeter Hall’s most basic article of faith—that all peoples could be raised to the same high level of civilization as themselves. Liberals always have a very strong self-concept as morally superior.

Moral posturing is of course front and center in the contemporary West. Joyce calls attention to an author who watched Steven Spielberg’s *Amistad*, recalling Whites “squirming in their seats,” and that afterwards a White couple emerged from the theatre “clinging to each other in a desperate attempt to manage the tragedy that had unfolded before them in graphic and picturesque fashion.” Joyce comments:

What we are thus seeing, in this and myriad other instances, is the emotional abuse and torture of a generation of Whites too ill-informed to generate appropriate intellectual or emotional responses to the fictions they are presented with. The dreamscape of Exeter Hall, in which traitors and murderers become national heroes, is entrenched. It has been absorbed, integrated, and assimilated into the White consciousness, and we, the ideological and psychological descendants of Dickens, are relegated to a much-maligned periphery for daring to suggest that the emperor has no clothes.

My article, which I summarize extensively (based on a recent talk) describes the movement to end slavery in the late 18th century which finally succeeded in ending the slave trade in 1807 and slavery itself in the 1830s. This material fits exactly with Jared Taylor’s review and Andrew Joyce’s article, and I attempt to develop a theory of why Whites are uniquely prone to pathological altruism and create moral ingroups composed of people who are racially different from themselves, in some cases even to the exclusion of their racial kin, as in the case of Exeter Hall. In fact, the historical data on the anti-slavery movement are completely redundant with Andrew Joyce’s findings on the reaction of Exeter Hall to the Morant Bay rebellion. We see the same crusading moral universalism and idealism, often

couched in specifically Christian religious terms. And as mentioned in the Jared's review, the movement to end slavery was a uniquely Western phenomenon.

My thesis is that this campaign of moral vilification relies on pre-existing tendencies among a great many Whites toward moral universalism and creating ingroups based on moral qualities rather than kinship.

Empathy: The abolitionist movement appealed to their audiences by emphasizing the suffering of slaves. The movement realized that “the way to stir men and women to action is not by biblical argument, but through the vivid, unforgettable description of acts of great injustice done to their fellow human beings. The abolitionists placed their hope not in sacred texts, but in human empathy.”

Moral universalism: Abolitionist appeals to mass audiences also emphasized the universalist ideology aimed at combating the idea that slaves were an outgroup rather than members of a common humanity. A famous medallion with a kneeling slave inscribed “Am I not a man and a brother?” was “reproduced everywhere from books and leaflets to snuffboxes and cufflinks, the image was an instant hit.”

Western uniqueness: One does not see Chinese people agonizing over the fact that the Han Chinese greatly expanded their territory at the expense of other peoples—a point brought out by Ricardo Duchesne in his groundbreaking *The Uniqueness of Western Civilization*. Nor does one see the Bantu peoples of Africa worrying about the ethics of displacing other African peoples as they spread far and wide from their homeland in Central Africa, including into South Africa where their treatment at the hands of White South Africans became Exhibit A for White evil during the apartheid era; nor do the Bantu-speaking peoples agonize about the widespread practice of slavery in Africa. Arabs do not apologize about their conquests in the name of Islam or their centuries-old role in slavery and the slave trade.

Only Whites have been made to feel moral disgust at their own past of conquest and expansion. And as elaborated below, only Whites—not all, to be sure, but a significant and important proportion—have felt moral outrage about slavery, to the point of banning it despite its material benefits to the society as a whole and to a great many individuals quite a bit like themselves.

The psychology of altruism and moral universalism

Within an evolutionary framework on personality, empathy is linked to Nurturance/Love, the personality system underlying close relationships of intimacy and trust that evolved in order to cement close family relationships. On average, women are more altruistic,

nurturing, and empathic than men, but of course there is a great deal of overlap between the sexes, just as there is with any trait—height, for example.

However, recent research shows that empathy tends to be directed at ingroup members. There is substantial research linking empathy to levels of oxytocin, but oxytocin operates to make people more altruistic and defensive toward their ingroup.

This research suggests that a good strategy for abolitionists would be to frame the African slaves as members of a common humanity—as members of an ingroup rather than an outgroup. In fact, as described below, abolitionist activists did indeed appeal to the common humanity of the African slaves. For example, for Reverend James Ramsay, the leading intellectual light of the Evangelical Anglicans, the point of opposition to slavery was to “gain to society, to reason, to religion, half a million of our kind, equally with us adapted for advancing themselves in every art and science that can distinguish man from man, equally with us capable of looking forward to and enjoying futurity.”

I also discuss Moral Idealism and the Ideology of Moral Universalism. Psychologically, this implies the ability of higher brain processes to suppress selfish tendencies that conflict with their ideals. Research has shown that people who are motivated can suppress ethnocentric tendencies and sexual urges via top-down control centered in the prefrontal cortex. People who are strongly motivated by empathy are particularly prone to moral idealism because their empathy motivates them in the same direction of their moral ideals, so that it would be easier to suppress egoistic desires.

Moral ideals may thus motivate people to control selfish behavior. Such a framework may be found in the abolitionist literature. For example, the seminal abolitionist writer Anthony Benezet, a Quaker, emphasized the need to suppress human pride and desire for worldly success by engaging in charitable works.

This implies that altruistic behavior is made easier because of the power of explicit processing over implicit processing—the worldly temptations implied by slavery may be suppressed, just as it is possible to suppress reward-oriented behavior, aggression, and ethnocentrism. For example, this implies that when people adopt ideologies of the left they see in the elite media and the educational system, having such an ideology motivates them to suppress healthy selfish tendencies.

Because it was the 18th century, such attitudes were embedded in religion:

Quakers: The Quakers were at the center of the movement to abolish slavery in England. Quaker networks and Quaker money were “of critical importance” in the early campaigns of 1787–1788; they were “the foremost champions of liberty for enslaved Africans.” In 1783 Quakers, with around 20,000 members, started an energetic campaign against slavery, responsible for the first petition to the House of Commons in 1783, the first anti-

slavery committees (beginning in 1783 and including the very influential Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade established in 1787), and the printing and distribution of antislavery literature. Quakers did the vast majority of the practical, day-to-day work of the Society and were a major source of funding.

Quaker religious ideology is the apotheosis of moral universalism—an ideology in which moral principles trump self-interest. A basic Quaker belief was that “the ‘Inner Light’ of God’s revelation shone equally on human beings of any race or class.” Like many contemporary leftists, for Anthony Benezet, an important Quaker writer, human equality “was an ontological fact rather than a philosophical doctrine or maxim”; in addition to his African slaves, he extended his interest to the welfare of Native Americans and the poor in Philadelphia. A statement by a Quaker subcommittee submitted to Parliament was titled *The Case of Our Fellow-Creatures, the Oppressed Africans*.

With the Quakers, we don’t see the tendency to despise the lower orders of one’s own race, as with Exeter Hall.

Quakers were also highly egalitarian: they were “democratic and nonhierarchical”; there were no bishops or ordained ministers, and any person (including women) could speak. As with hunter-gatherer groups policy was passed by consensus of the entire meeting. Quakers were economically successful, a merchant class capable of devoting substantial resources to the cause of anti-slavery activism.

John Woolman, the “Quintessential Quaker,” was an eighteenth-century figure who opposed slavery, lived humbly, and, amazingly from an evolutionary perspective, felt guilty about preferring his own children to children on the other side of the world. Like other Quakers, Anthony Benezet certainly did not see opposition to slavery in terms of personal ambition: “Like most Quakers, Anthony Benezet showed little interest in self-promotion. Unprepossessing and lacking in charisma, he had a greater interest in charity than in burnishing his reputation.”

By their actions, the Quakers created a moral ingroup in which those outside the ingroup were seen as immoral, while being inside the moral ingroup fed into their self-esteem. In short, their brain circuits underlying morality and self-righteousness were activated.

Quakerism was an offshoot of Puritanism, developing in the context of the Puritan revolution and sharing many attitudes and ideas. This includes attitudes on the moral basis of society (“purify the world” and “visible sainthood” among believers).

These attitudes had strong repercussions throughout eighteenth-century England. Although Puritans per se were not at the forefront of the movement to abolish slavery, Jones’s work shows that the Puritan ethic was at the roots of what she describes as the eighteenth century’s “sustained humanitarianism and generous philanthropy.” Besides

foundling homes, education for poor children, and other programs for the lower orders of British society, there was also a great deal of concern for African slaves.

Other religions, notably Methodism and some members of the Church of England had similar attitudes on slavery.

The affective revolution in England: an ethnic hypothesis

An ethnic hypothesis proposes that the eighteenth century saw the emergence of an ethos of egalitarianism that reflected the evolutionary past of an important segment of the British population as Northern hunter-gatherers. European groups are part of what Burton *et al.* term the North Eurasian and Circumpolar culture area. This culture area derives from hunter-gatherers adapted to cold, ecologically adverse climates. In such climates there is pressure for male provisioning of the family and a tendency toward monogamy because the ecology did not support either polygyny or large groups for an evolutionarily significant period. These cultures are characterized by bilateral kinship relationships which recognize both the male and female lines, suggesting a more equal contribution for each sex as would be expected under conditions of monogamy.

There is also less emphasis on extended kinship relationships and marriage tends to be exogamous (i.e., outside the kinship group). Historian John Hajnal has established that the simple household type based on a single married couple and their children is typical of Northwest Europe. It contrasts with the joint family structure typical of the rest of Eurasia in which the household consists of two or more related couples, typically brothers and their wives and other members of the extended family. An archeological excavation of a 4,600-year-old site in modern Germany found evidence for monogamy and exogamy, both strong markers of individualism.

The data thus show that Europeans, and especially Northwest Europeans, tend toward individualism. These societies were relatively quick to abandon extended kinship networks and collectivist social structures when their interests were protected with the rise of strong centralized governments.

Egalitarianism is a notable trait of hunter-gatherer groups around the world. Such groups have mechanisms that prevent despotism and ensure reciprocity, with punishment ranging from physical harm to shunning and ostracism. David Hackett Fischer emphasizes the egalitarian ethic that developed in New Zealand and Australia during the “Second Empire” in the nineteenth century: the “Tall Poppy Syndrome” (envy and resentment of people who are “conspicuously successful, exceptionally gifted, or unusually creative”). “It sometimes became a more general attitude of outright hostility to any sort of excellence, distinction, or high achievement—especially achievement that requires mental effort,

sustained industry, or applied intelligence. The possession of extraordinary gifts is perceived as unfair by others who lack them.”

This egalitarianism enforced by shunning that is so common today in Western countries is entirely reminiscent of the Jante Laws of Scandinavia which “mandate” that no one can rise above the others in the group. In my experience, the 10 commandments of Jante Law are well-known among Scandinavians as an aspect of self-identity.

- Don’t think you are as good as us.
- Don’t think you are smarter than us.
- Don’t fancy yourself better than us.
- Don’t think you know more than us.

Reflecting this pattern, Scandinavian society in general has a history of relatively small income and social class differences, including the absence of serfdom during the Middle Ages. A recent anthropological study of hunter-gatherers found that the economic inequality approximated that of modern Denmark. Moreover, socialist economic practices (including national health care) and women’s rights came relatively easily to Scandinavia as well as to “Second Empire” societies such as New Zealand. The movements discussed in here may be seen as the beginnings of the trend toward the far more advanced social welfare practices of twenty-first-century Western societies.

Anthropologist Christopher Boehm describes hunter-gatherer societies as moral communities in which women have a major role. In such societies, people are closely scrutinized to note deviations from social norms; violators are shunned, ridiculed, and ostracized. Decisions, including decisions to sanction a person, are by consensus. Adult males treat each other as equals.

All of these features are characteristic of Quakers and other groups discussed here. Like the original Puritans, the Quakers formed a group apart, where group membership was based on moral/ideological conformity. They were a “holy nation” who, also like the Puritans, desired that England become a Holy Commonwealth—the nation as moral ingroup. Indeed, the beliefs of the Quakers “were often the same as those of the Puritans. Even characteristically Quaker teachings were often puritan attitudes pushed to severe conclusions.” Membership was not based on kinship but was open to anyone who accepted the moral/ideological basis of the group. There was

a watchful regard for morals of the society, and a strict determination to bring all misdemeanors to account. Friends were regularly appointed to examine into and to report on the state of the society. Did a member neglect to attend on the means of grace, or was he guilty of “disorderly walking,” he was exhorted in a brotherly way.

The hunter-gatherer ethic implies that one's moral character becomes the most important aspect of ingroup status. Individuals maintain their position in society by subscribing to its moral norms. Fundamentally, the movement to end slavery operated by defining abolitionism as a moral ingroup psychologically analogous to the situation in a hunter-gatherer ingroup. Those who continued to advocate the slave trade and slavery were shunned as moral pariahs, just as "racists" are today. The moral basis of the anti-slavery ingroup was firmly grounded in genuine empathic responses to the suffering of the slaves.

The logic connecting these tendencies to the individualist hunter-gather model is that like all humans in a dangerous and difficult world, hunter-gatherers need to develop cohesive, cooperative ingroups. But rather than base them on known kinship relations, the prototypical egalitarian-individualist groups of Northwest Europe are based on moral reputation and trust. Rather than being based on known kinship relations or ingroup/outgroup relations based on ethnicity, they are open to other reputable and trustworthy individuals. Egalitarian-individualists create moral-ideological communities in which those who violate public trust and other manifestations of the moral order are shunned, ostracized, and exposed to public humiliation—a fate that would have resulted in evolutionary death during the harsh ecological period of the Ice Age.

Ethnic Origins

As David Hackett Fischer notes in *Albion's Seed*, the Puritans and Quakers both originated mainly from groups that had emigrated from Scandinavia in prehistoric times, and their cultures reflect the strong egalitarian universalist tendencies of Scandinavia described above and apparent in the antislavery movement. Puritanism originated in East Anglia, which was settled by Angles and Jutes (both from the Jutland Peninsula) in prehistoric times. They produced "a civic culture of high literacy, town meetings, and a tradition of freedom," distinguished from other British groups by their "comparatively large ratios of freemen and small numbers of *servi* and *villani*."

There was a strong strand of moral universalism and concern with fairness apparent in the Puritan-descended intellectuals who dominated American intellectual life in the nineteenth century and formed the intellectual force behind the American abolitionist movement. In the nineteenth century, these intellectuals placed a high value on fairness—for example, strongly opposing slavery on moral grounds. They tended to pursue utopian causes framed as moral issues. Opposing sides were painted in stark contrasts of good versus evil. Whereas in the Puritan settlements of Massachusetts the moral fervor was directed at keeping fellow Puritans in line, in the nineteenth century it was directed at the entire country and focused on the evils of slavery and capitalism.

One example among many is Orestes Brownson, an important nineteenth-century intellectual and orator. He admired the Universalists' belief in the inherent dignity of all

people and the promise of eventual universal salvation for all believers. He argued for the unity of races and the inherent dignity of each person, and he was fiercely opposed to Southerners for trying to enlarge their political base. Writing in 1840, Brownson claimed that we should “realize in our social arrangements and in the actual conditions of all men that equality of man and man” that God had established but which had been destroyed by capitalism.

Like the Puritans, the Quakers stem from a distinctive, ethnically based British subculture originating in Scandinavia. The predominant region for Quakers in England was the North Midlands colonized by Viking invaders who prized individual ownership of houses and fields; they spoke Norse into the twelfth century. They were seen by others as independent and egalitarian, dressing alike and eating together. “Their houses were sparsely furnished, and their culture made a virtue of simplicity and plain speech.” In 1654, a Quaker described their philosophy of living as

the strippings of all needless Apparel, and the forsaking of superfluities in Meats [and] Drinks; and in the plain self-denying Path we walked, having the fear and dread of God in our Souls, that we were afraid of offending in word or deed: our Words were few and savory, our Countenances Grave and Deportment Weighty. Indeed we were a plain broken-hearted, contrite spirited, self-denying people.

Quakers tended to be relatively poor farmers working poor, rocky soil. Historically, they were dominated by an oppressive foreign elite and made virtues of simplicity and hard work in a harsh environment.

Conclusion

There is a clear continuity between the moral communities that emerged in the eighteenth century and the contemporary world. The logic of moral universalism based on empathic concern is now ubiquitous, rationalizing everything from wars of liberation against oppressive dictators to alleviating the suffering of animals. It is a lynchpin for policy on immigration and refugees, ethnic relations, poverty, and much else.

These tendencies toward egalitarianism and moral universalism were presumably adaptive within small hunter-gatherer groups in the environment Northern Europeans evolved in. In the context of freeing slaves by a dominant group whose dominance was not threatened by the action, one might certainly argue that it was not pathological altruism. However, moral universalism is not adaptive in the modern world where migration is cheap and easy, and where empathy and altruism toward migrants are routinely manipulated by hostile elites to serve their material and ethnic interests.

In this regard, a particular feature of the modern world bears mentioning: although the anti-slavery movement beginning in the late eighteenth century certainly took advantage of the available media (newspapers favored abolition at least by 1792), the reach and power of the mass media are far greater today. Because of the power of higher brain centers, media messages can be used to frame events in a way that evokes empathy and therefore rationalizes actions that may cynically serve other interests.

Perhaps most crucially, the media continues to create messages of White guilt, so that for many Whites, being opposed to any positive form of White identity and any sense that Whites have legitimate interests have become moral imperatives. This is a disaster.

White guilt is central to the ideology of the new elite. This ideology pathologizes the people and culture of the West—it makes Whites into moral pariahs, deprives Whites of moral capital, and makes Whites a people for whom there is no legitimate basis for having a sense of White interests or even identifying as a White person. It is no secret that Jews are a prominent component of this new elite. Andrew Joyce describes “a Jewish academic and cultural stance which places Jews outside “Whiteness” and Western civilization, and therefore outside its past, despite strong Jewish involvement in the slave trade and in slave ownership.

Andrew Joyce provides an appropriate conclusion for this train of thought:

I do not subscribe to the opinion that the past can help us to discern the future, but if I could venture one suggestion, it would be this: to end the monopoly of morality enjoyed by the inmates currently running this asylum. The White man is currently in a degraded state, and never before has he been presented as such an immoral creature. Nativism in the United States in the 1920s was successful in large part because they attached themselves to moral causes—they opposed criminality, they joined in the temperance movement, they were moral crusaders. I am not by any means advocating a drive for prohibition, but if concern for morality is at the heart of White pathology, if it is the source of our weakness, it must be turned to our strength, it must be reclaimed to our advantage.

“White Pathology: Special issue of *The Occidental Quarterly*”
(*The Occidental Observer*, October 12, 2012).

Editor's note:

Sometimes the entrails of a topic are shown in a lively, informal discussion in addition to scholarly journals. The following section reproduces a few comments in several blogsites' threads.

Informal texts

Our problem is us, not the Jew.

—Farnham O'Reilly

Ryckaert *et al*

Franklin Ryckaert

It would be nice if a person with the talent of a Prof. MacDonald would write a trilogy on the problem dealing with:

- 1) The innate psychological characteristics of Whites (individualism, abstract idealism, universal moralism).
- 2) The influence of Christianity and its secular outgrowth of Liberalism (inversion of values, altruism as the only form of moralism even to a suicidal degree).
- 3) The Jewish exploitation of both.

Central to the weakness of Whites is what I call *naïve inclusivism*.

It is naïve because it not only believes that all non-white peoples can and want to become like Westerners, but also that including them in Western societies will lead to a Utopia instead of racial suicide. This naïve inclusivism is as old as the European expansion outside Europe itself:

- Alexander the Great wanted to include all peoples of the Middle East in his Hellenistic ideal, even initiating miscegenation with them.
- The Romans included all non-European peoples in their Empire bequeathing Roman citizenship to all who they thought deserved it. They even had one time an Arab emperor (Philippos Arabs).
- When the Western European peoples began to colonize the world, they made the same mistake. The Spaniards and Portuguese miscegenated with the natives of their colonies on a mass scale and later also with their imported African slaves.
- The Dutch miscegenated with the Indonesians and accepted their mixed offspring as “Europeans.”

- The French accepted educated Blacks, the so-called *évolués*, as their equals. France doesn't keep statistics about its ethnic and racial minorities because it considers them all as "Frenchmen."
- Only the British kept aloof from the natives in their colonies and didn't allow them to immigrate into the white settlement colonies or Britain itself. But that has now radically changed, the British having become the most extreme both in terms of immigration and miscegenation.

We simply cannot ascribe this suicidal behaviour to Jewish machinations, rather it is the age-old inclination of Europeans to include the whole world in a universal ideal. You aptly describe Jewish destructive influence as an "epiphenomenon."¹³ It couldn't function as it does without the above-described preconditions.

Brad Griffin

A commenter asked:

Why are Jews leading white nations to begin with? What level of idiocy does it take to allow your nation to voluntarily be led by a foreign tribe? That's the question.

Griffin responded:

Ever since the French Revolution—see what happened in Haiti—, the answer has been liberalism.

Yankees believed in liberal capitalist democracy and their ideology legitimized the Jewish takeover of their society without a shot being fired. Germany put up more resistance under Hitler because Germans were less committed to liberalism.

It's really that simple: Jews thrive in liberal democracies, under communism, and other systems that substitute abstract ideology for ethnic or religious solidarity.

¹³ "The Jewish Problem is an epiphenomenon of the deranged altruism resulting from the secular fulfillment of universal Christian values."

Is Jewish influence bad? Of course.

It is a secondary infection. Jews don't thrive in the Muslim world, China, Japan and other places because the conditions there aren't favorable to Jews like they were in early twentieth century Yankeeland.

Yankees believed that Jews had a right to own their newspapers and film industry. They had a right to accumulate vast amounts of wealth and participate on an equal basis in their political system. The rest is history.

* * *

The strong feeling that Jews are bad and should be expelled is a healthy sentiment because Jewish influence has negative consequences.

What allowed the Jews to become so powerful? The culprit is Americanism which left the native population defenseless against the Jewish assault in the early twentieth century. Even without the Jews, Americanism alone had already inspired Yankees to destroy the South.

Liberalism also inspired Britain and France to inflict incredible damage on their Caribbean colonies.

* * *

Keep in mind that Jews as Jews were never expelled from the United States, stripped of their citizenship and voting rights, required to live in ghettos, prohibited from marrying Gentiles, or banned from culturally sensitive institutions.

Contrast the United States with Spain which expelled Jews, persecuted them during the Inquisition, forced them to convert to Christianity and drove them out of the country. In the Northern states, the red carpet was rolled out for them in line with the dominant liberal ideology.

In light of the experience of the world in dealing with Jews, how could it have ended any other way? This is like a White man allowing his daughter to marry a Negro and who is then shocked when he beats and kills her.

* * *

For those who don't believe Whites are capable of imposing this madness on themselves, I will point to France during the French Revolution which abolished slavery in the name of the "Rights of Man" and made every Negro a citizen of the French Republic.

The triumph of anti-racism and egalitarian fanaticism just happened to coincide with the French Revolution and the 1848 Revolution.

Occigent

It's the Jews' fault Whites let them into Harvard? It's the Jews' fault that Whites let them take over academia? It's the Jews' fault that Roosevelt was a communist? It's the Jews' fault that Whites handed over their civilization?

The only wild conspiracy going on here is that Whites aren't responsible for their own beds.

Anyone who tells you that the state of the ethnic ship upon which our mind weapons are mounted is not now and has not always been our direct and personal responsibility is a Jew-trained welfare mind white house *wigger*¹⁴ that should be immediately cast overboard. We'll be lucky enough as it is to get this rusty old scow to safe harbor without that dead weight.

We are the most powerful people in the world. We can change the future tomorrow. Don't let the victimcrats hobble your vision, your clarity, and most important of all, that lost Jewel of White Civilization, your personal responsibility. To your people, to your culture, and to God: Do not ever let someone get in the way of that responsibility. They are the enemy. And they will drag you further down into the pits of hell.

Repeat. Our ship is not the Muslim's responsibility, it is not the Jews' responsibility. It is our responsibility. So wake the fuck up and stop giving other people power over you.

People: Get real. We love what the Jews do for us. We love the entertainment, we love the *laissez-faire* attitude, we love the sex, we love the drugs, we love the *rock and roll*. And we get drunk on it, and they take it too far.

But for God's sake, open your eyes. Get real with yourselves. History is rife with whites who would sell their soul for lollipop, as is Washington DC, and as long as there are such whites, which will be always, there will always be Jews to accommodate them.

¹⁴ A male Caucasian, usually born and raised in the suburbs that displays a strong desire to emulate African American Hip Hop culture. (Note of the Ed.)

Do we wish that Jews would not accommodate us in our sin? Yes. We do. Is it the Jews' fault that we sin? No. It is not. It is our fault.

Right now, as we speak, there are probably a million Jews engaged in commerce and entertainment to fill the needs of a hundred million white sinners. And we do nothing to stop it. And that's their fault?

Sebastian Ernst Ronin said:

A plea into the wind, beautifully expressed though. When it hurts enough, then yes, maybe. Until such time, the culture of victimhood serves the purposes of an infantile "White genocide" meme.

FuturodellanaZIONE said:

Monocausalism seems to be most popular with relatively uneducated/fanatical European National Socialist types. It isn't nuanced or especially cerebral, but it's a convenient gate to open for useful idiots. The Islamists use monocausalism to recruit suicide bombers. It's a smart tack and one that works for certain crowds.

Johan Hoeff said:

Kudos to Occigent for his presentation; the second Thread was worthy of note, for the depth and common-sense approach to our present, if not our historical life. We are Masters of our own ship, or we are not.

Roger

It saddens me to say it, but Larry Mars is correct. There was no mention in the Labour Party's 1997 manifesto of any plan to bring millions upon millions of new people in, but it was still obvious to all observant people that they were social revolutionaries and radical egalitarians with a deep commitment of the destruction of the English constitution (they were highly successful at achieving their ends). There was a clear antecedent from previous decades, however, during which time the Labour Party had started the process of coloured immigration from the ex-colonies.

The Conservative Party had continued to support the process whenever it was in government, and its leaders marginalised Enoch Powell when he made his famous speech in 1968. Nobody can seriously claim not to have known Labour were pro-immigration, although the average voter might not have been able to predict the extent of it. We know, from admissions by a Labour scriptwriter called Andrew Neather, and more recently from the Jew Peter Mandelson, that they deliberately used immigration as a means of “rubbing the Right’s nose in diversity,” and went so far as to send recruitment teams abroad to find people to move here. This was well-known within the party’s leading ranks, but absent from their public statements. When Neather made the rare mistake of being honest to a journalist about immigration, most people paid little attention to it.

The results of their actions were plain to see by the time the next election came along in 2001. By this time, there had been several race riots in Northern England (not for the first time) and a significant increase in the level of net migration—and they still got re-elected. No adult could profess ignorance at this point: a vote for Labour was very obviously a vote for mass-immigration, multiculturalism and the erosion of liberty. Four more years passed, during which time the Iraq war was initiated, another huge wave of immigration came along, and the government revoked a law banning homosexual propaganda from schools (“Section 28”) and decided to give queers the “right” to form civil unions—and they got re-elected *again*. Their manifesto during that election campaign included a pledge to introduce new laws criminalising “Racial and Religious Hatred,” which would re-enforce the pre-existing Race Relations Acts supported by all three of the main political parties.

By 2010, the voters decided to kick them out and replace them with the Conservative Party, whose leader refers to himself as the “heir to Blair” and does not differ from the Labour Party in any substantial way. The Conservatives did not manage to win a parliamentary majority, and they depend on the support of the Liberal Democrats to get their legislation passed (which is not a problem because the two parties agree about almost everything, but pretend not to as part of the democratic media circus). Since then, mass-immigration has continued unabated, there have been more race riots, crime has continued to increase, and now the government is pushing through homosexual marriage laws while denouncing their critics as “swivel-eyed loons.” If you look at the opinion polls for the next general election to see how people are planning to react against the failed Conservative-Liberal government, you will find that they are going to respond by voting the Labour Party back in! A Labour Party led, no less, by a Jew.

It is unbelievable that people can continue to vote for the enemies of civilisation time and time again. The only reasonable conclusion is that the voters really do support their own national suicide.

Here’s the funny thing: in every election since 2001, less than half of the population has turned out to vote. Tens of millions of people are not even registered with the electoral

roll, making them ineligible to vote. These apathetic people cannot complain about our woes if they will not even do something as easy as vote for the BNP. Of the minority of Brits who actually turn out to vote, less than half have voted for the winning party in each of the last four elections. The parties are not popular at all, but the apathy of the non-voters is akin to complicity. If they object to it, they should get themselves on the electoral register and vote for the BNP. There have been plenty of opportunities to do this, but people simply refuse.

Truly, “optimism is cowardice”! I have no idea how the UK (or Sweden) is going to recover from this. People’s brains have been turned to mush. It is intolerable. No wonder Dominique Venner topped himself.

Larry Mars

Today, *The Drudge Report* linked an article about the fifth day in a row of “youths” in Stockholm burning the city.

If you guys have any delusions about regular Whites watching appalling events like these (or, for that matter, the beheading of a British soldier by a repellent Black Muslim in London two days ago), and awakening to the racial dimension of the trouble mass immigration has put them in, you just have to read the comment section of this article to be disabused. Even when the commenters agree that there may be something wrong with “youths” supposedly protesting against perceived social injustices by destroying public and private property at random, they just can’t see the larger pattern of non-Whites terrorizing the White majority—in Stockholm, in London, in Paris—year after year, after year.

How could these European societies have gone so low as to allow this surreal situation to become possible? Whatever the answer, one thing is certain in my mind after seeing the popular reaction at these events: trying to save these White societies as a whole is a mission doomed to failure, not only due to the level of moral decadence that the bulk of the public has sunk to, but also due to the pace of miscegenation of the native populations with the non-white immigrants. Whites with non-White relatives are an ever increasingly growing number of people and these folks will never support a White Nationalist movement in their countries. Never.

The point I’m trying to make is this: the cause of White Nationalism is such a hopeless one given the disconnect between the White public at large and our views (which they see as abhorrent and despicable) that, maybe, the most feasible strategy would be to try and save a number of Whites that is just enough not to let the race go extinct; and then

proceed to get a *Lebensraum* somewhere by whatever means. When a huge fire ravages through your house, you don't try to save everything, just what is really indispensable.

Let's be honest to ourselves: racially-conscious Whites are by a long shot the most far sighted individuals of their societies. I know that. You guys know that to. But I just don't believe it is realistic to expect the average white to achieve this level of consciousness.

Historically speaking, Whites hardly ever have seen themselves as Whites proper—but rather as British, French, Germans or simply as Christians. It is true that a number of Germans during the Third Reich and, until a recent past, a number of Americans while in contact with Blacks and Indians did see themselves as Whites proper, but the question is: how long did this racial consciousness last? And if all it takes to root out this racial awareness from their minds is some amount of politically-correct propaganda, then the notion of a solid White, racially conscious nation is a hopeless one indeed—it's like to consider building a castle on a sandbank.

As a Brazilian, I know where today's White nations are headed to. Something like 15% of Brazil's population is pure White, which makes up something like 30 million people. The problem is, the overwhelming majority of these people has non-White friends; has a relative married to a non-White, has married a non-White and/or has himself/herself non-White children. That is to say, the overwhelming majority of these folks are forever lost to the White Nationalist cause—and this will be your situation pretty soon.

In such a depressing scenario, maybe the lesser evil would be to try and close ranks among ourselves instead of trying to save people who do not want to be saved.

Pessimist as I may sound, there is an ultimately successful precedent for our cause: the kikes and their founding of modern Israel. If they have managed to get their own land, Whites can do the same—especially if we give up the naive notion that all Whites deserve to be saved from wholesale miscegenation and the world chaos that will ensue from it. In my humble opinion the Jewish State should be put side by side with works like *Mein Kampf* as road map for the White Nationalist movement.

Commenter said:

What you say doesn't invalidate my remark that people who are cowering in front of the anti-White dictatorship often misinterpret their own behavior as foolish sentimentality.

Immigrants are pouring into Western countries at the invitation of Western governments, and at the consternation of most White people. If White people had their say, for example, in a referendum, immigration would stop. So, if you would like to blame White people, you have to blame their lack of courage, not their foolish sentimentality.

Mars responded:

Anti-White dictatorship?! I beg you pardon. Last time I checked every single Western European and Northern American government had been elected by popular, democratic vote. Who voted these governments into office and where do these politicians come from? From what you're saying, one might get the impression that these politicians are aliens from outer space who came to Earth in order to abet the niggerization, arabization and mestization of these countries; or that it is extraterrestrials who are voting for these folks, instead of adult nationals who have had ample opportunity to see (and live with) the consequences of their stupid political choices for several decades now.

Look, I have all sympathy for the people of North Korea, for example. They certainly haven't had any say in their government ever since the mid 50's. Their country was kidnapped by a gang of sociopaths with the aid of a million-strong army. They are real victims. There is a real case to be made that they are not responsible for what is happening to them. But for you to refer to contemporary North American and Western Europeans as poor, oppressed folks, terrorized into cowardice by autocratic, unaccountable governments (as you take it for granted that that is the case) is disingenuous, with all due respect.

I said something to this effect on another thread and a reader, Roger, apparently an English European himself, agreed a hundred percent with me. Trying to argue that their stupidity *and* their cowardice is in fact just cowardice is beside the point. The point is that Western Whites are ultimately fully responsible for what is befalling them. And trying to exonerate them from their sin against both their ancestors and their future generations is to assure that nothing will be done about it.

Whites have let the kikes in and have let them take control of their governments, finances, academia and press. Whites have allowed the inferior non-White scum to colonize their societies. To blame "the elites" or "the political class" is a lame excuse because these segments of society are part and parcel of said societies. Besides, the political class depends on votes to stay in power and what's more, "the elites" can perfectly well be boycotted into poverty, since we are not talking about Ancient Regime aristocracy here. If stupid liberal Whites can boycott a restaurant chain because its owner said something that displeased gays, the reason why the treacherous elite stays where it is, is because Whites want it to be there.

To quote John Derbyshire, discussing the Jewish Question in a context that twists the meaning of what he said (I despise his philosemitism with all my heart):

97 percent of the U.S. population [and the European one, for that matter] ended up dancing to the tune of the other three percent. If that is true, the only thing to say is the one Shakespeare's Bianca would have said: "The more fool they." ¹⁵

If Whites can mobilize for idiotic causes like homosexual "marriage," "human rights," "wymyn's rights," "global warming" and at the same time they don't organize to tackle real issues like Third World immigration it is because they don't want to. They are not interested. If they are not aware of the JQ, it is because they are not interested. And if they keep voting for treacherous politicians who have fucked their asses it is because they don't mind it. So let them live with the consequences. At the end of the day, you have to sleep on the bed you made, right?

Mars quotes Sunic:

"Blaming Christianity is a sort of taboo topic in most of the English-speaking White Nationalist blogosphere." (Tomislav Sunic)

It is a taboo topic in the whole WN blogosphere, César.

These folks are ready to speak the unspeakable about race differences and the Jewish Problem. But they refuse to take the final step and face the fact that, if it was not for Christianity, perhaps we would not have to be discussing all of these problems now because they might not have happened in the first place.

How can someone advocate for the dignity and self-reliance of the White race while operating within a non-White, Levantine cult?

How can these people expose the Jews and their race supremacist cult while worshipping a Jew (!) and making extensive use of the Jewish mythology and the Jewish Weltanschauung?

It is mind-boggling...

My view about the core problems facing the White race today is that Judaism, Christianity, Islam and Communism are Semitic and therefore alien, extraneous ideologies that should be consigned to the trashcan of History. The differences I see among them nowadays are close to irrelevant as far as our interests are concerned.

I have the utmost respect for Matt Parrott—the guy is brilliant, and he is a real fighter for the White cause. However, what he and other white nationalists regrettably fail to see is

¹⁵ In Act 5, Scene 2 of *The Taming of the Shrew* by William Shakespeare there's a line, "The more fool you for betting on my loyalty."

that a “Racist Christianity” is an oxymoron. Here’s Saint Paul to give the final word on the question (Galatians 3:28): “There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.”

In passages like this you have the real seeds of the French Revolution, Communism and modern Liberalism. For God’s sake, this is *avant-garde* Egalitarianism writ large!

I wonder what part our “Christian race realist” friends don’t understand in the sentence “There is neither Jew nor Gentile... for you are all one in Christ Jesus.” After all, if we are all brothers and sisters in Christ, how can someone in his own mind argue against racial intermixing, for example?

Matt seems to claim that Medieval Christianity was not afflicted by the modern mainstream Christian attitude towards the racial question. That’s true, but the point is: was it so due to Christianity or in spite of it? The fact of the matter is that the Christian *ethos* is so out of touch with reality, so fundamentally impractical that a number of compromises had to be made by the European peoples on which it was imposed over time so it could be rendered minimally functional.

Any society that wished to take suicidal teachings like “Turn the other cheek” or “Resist not Evil” seriously would be enslaved overnight; a society that wished to take at face value teachings preaching that the rich will almost certainly be sentenced to Hell and that one should not worry about tomorrow but rather one should give everything away to the poor—a society that had gone insane enough to implement such ideas would implode almost immediately.

Therefore, it is obvious that a number of Christian tenets had to be simply ignored or rationalized into oblivion so that it could become a mainstream doctrine. Being the Europeans who they were and being surrounded by an ocean of hostile populations on all sides as it was the case, it is obvious that Christianity also had to be sort of “Aryanized.” In other words, the notion of all humankind being one big family in Christ did not translate into Arabs, Blacks and Central Asians being invited to move *en masse* to Europe and being offered white maidens as brides.

The problem is that time passes and over time and with the help of improving life conditions, all of the radically liberal/egalitarian tenets of Christianity that could not be immediately put into practice by its adherents in the past eventually blossomed into reality. A number of philosophers and thinkers, for example Eric Voegelin, have established beyond the shadow of a doubt that the deep historical and ideological roots of the Left are to be found in certain Catholic heresies of the High Middle Ages. And it should come as no surprise if one seriously thinks about it for a minute. The leftist egalitarianism that has plagued the West ever since the French Revolution and that has gone into overdrive since the World War II neither appeared nor has taken root anywhere outside of the realm of

the Christian World. To their credit, it wasn't the Muslim, the Chinese or the Indian civilizations that invented this crap and in spite of the nominally Communist regime they have in China today, those folks couldn't care less about any so-called "universal human rights" that have been the epicenter of all forms of Leftism since Rousseau.

Let's face the fact, my race realist Christian friends: the pseudo-historical figure of Jesus was a typical liberal Jew. The egalitarian cancer that is at the base of the destruction of the white race is just the natural development of a number of elements that are part and parcel of the Christian ideology.

Please tell me how can you guys tell a Black man that although he is your brother in Christ you don't want him to live in the same society as you? Or rather, how can you say that with a straight face? And don't get me wrong, I'm all for racial separation, but mind you, I am not a Christian. I don't buy for a second the childish notion that we all belong to a big human family in Christ.

It puzzles me to see intelligent, well-informed white nationalists, the overwhelming majority of whom are quite aware of the Jewish question, worshiping an *avant la letter* revolutionary Jew who owes nothing in terms of radicalism to a liberal Jew like the abominable talk-show host Alan Colmes!

Christian race realists should ponder on Tom Sunic's brilliant articles on the paradox of a so-called "Christian white nationalism" that are available both at *The Occidental Observer* and at *The West Darkest Hour*. This passage summarizes his view on the subject quite well:

How can a white nationalist, a racialist, or a traditionalist, or whatever he may call himself, and regardless of whether he lives in Europe or America, successfully combat hostile and alien worldviews and adopt different methods of conceptualisation, while at the same time revering these same alien referents and the same paradigms which are, ironically, part and parcel of the same non-European mindset he wishes to reject?

The matrix of the West, as Pierre Krebs argues, is no longer territorial or political. It lies in the white man's experiment with Christianity, which began as merely an obscure Oriental cult—a cult which has absolutely nothing in common with the spiritual homeland of the white man: ancient Greece.

The answer Krebs offers to intelligent white readers in America and Europe who are seeking an exit from the modern multicultural straitjacket and the conceptual mendacity of liberalism is simple, although it will require a great deal of courage: the return to our lost pre-Christian European roots. *Novus rerum nascitur ordo.*

A Christian white nationalism is a self-defeating ideology. You can't fight the Jewish mental and material onslaught against the white race while you borrow their mythology at the same time. In fact, the situation is even worse than that: Judaism proper is a sadistic

cult, whereas Christianity, the fake doctrine the kikes heaped upon you, is a masochistic one. Put gasoline and matches together and you have the picture of our current situation.

Excerpted from discussions at *The Occidental Observer*,
Occidental Dissent and *The West's Darkest Hour* in recent years.

E-mail exchange

Friday, July 12, 2013

Hey Larry,

I am increasingly concerned about the coming currency crash. If I don't convince my family to allow me sell the real estate at market price, I am screwed. The collapse might happen this year or the next one... How is life going on in Brazil by the way?

César

Sunday, July 14

Well, things in Brazil are beginning to unravel. I don't know if you are following the news on the media, but there have been many protests all over the country in the past weeks—as usual, in cases like this organized and instigated by the far Left. The reason for this is that inflation is back and the current communist government (in power for ten years now) is beginning to lose control over it. I think it's the beginning of the end.

But for the moment, things are still ok despite of these problems. I can't possibly complain about my material life except for the fact that, like you, I have to live surrounded by folks who disgust me. The good news is that I'm going to Europe in early February, next year.

Larry

Sunday, July 14

Changing subjects, is there anyone in Brazil in jail for saying things racists? Just curious...

César

Sunday, July 14

There must be people being legally prosecuted for racism in Brazil, but I wouldn't be able to recall any particular cases.

You see, since almost everybody here is brown/black and since the school system and the media have been so successful in indoctrinating the stupid masses about the inexistence of race, the country's legal anti-racist apparatus sort of becomes obsolete in the face of the voluntary anti-racism of the populace.

I think this is what some commentators call "the São Paulo effect": when the effects of miscegenation and its attending dysgenic consequences are so deep and pervasive, people don't need to be thought-patrolled anymore because they have become so stupid that even if they got in touch with undesirable ideas (such as racism) they would be too stupid to digest and process them anyway.

This is a nation of brain-dead half-niggers and mestizos. There's nothing to be done about it.

Larry

Sunday, July 14

And I guess that whites are as stupid and racially deracinated as they are here in Mexico?

César

Monday, July 15

If not more so. ☺

Brazil has a population of around 185 million people, of whom something between 10-15 percent are pure Whites. It means that there are more Whites in Brazil than in the whole of the Scandinavian countries combined. Just think.

But these Whites have long sold out to the current Antifa world order. They want to keep a low profile, get a job and have a good time. That is to say, they're like the

rest of Whites everywhere. Unfortunately, the future of Whites in Brazil is simply to be absorbed by the ocean of non-Whites surrounding them.

Take this guy for example [*Mars adds a Facebook link*]. He used to be my best friend when I was a kid. He is not a pure White because he has some Indian blood on his mother side. But to make things infinitely worse, what did he do? He married this niggress [*pic in the Facebook page*] and has had little half-black children with her. I hadn't seen the guy in many years until I found him on Facebook, but having seen that he had married this she-monkey, I refused to contact the guy.

But his case is the general rule in Brazil. Most Whites will marry, date or have children with non-Whites and they see no problem with that, which means that this place has literally no future because it is the minority of Whites who keep things running here. As Whites disappear, there will be no elite to fly the plane—and the plane, being flown by apes, will eventually crash just like it is currently happening in South Africa.

But fortunately, when it happens, I will have been long away from this shithole.

Larry

Monday July 15

Fascinating. Removing the obvious stuff (your friend's link, etc) what about publishing these emails in *West's Darkest Hour*?

César

Monday July 15

That's fine with me. You know, there's a saying here: "Brazil is the country of the future." In a sinister way, Brazil *is* the country of the future.

The pervasive miscegenation that is the signature of the country's social fabric will become the sad lot of every single White country in the West until the end of this century, with predictable consequences.

Non-Whites will absorb Whites in the First World, just like they have done in Brazil. São Paulo once was a European metropolis grafted in South America. Rio de Janeiro once was a European metropolis grafted in South America. Now they're

just sprawling slums teeming with blacks and mestizos surrounding urban areas inhabited by middle-class Whites living in constant fear of being robbed, raped, kidnapped or murdered.

And the same thing will eventually happen to places like Los Angeles, London, Paris and other (still) First World metropolises. They'll become huge ungovernable slums, just like São Paulo and Río.

This will be the Brazilian Century. You can call it *Brave, Brazilian New World*.

Larry Mars

Part VI

Why I gave up white nationalism

A lone voice

“In degenerated Puritanism lies, side by side with Judaism,
America’s inborn danger.”

—Giselher Wirsing

From the editor's desk

Next books

My genocidal views about mankind, which I consider a failed species that might be redeemed not with white nationalism but with an improved National Socialism, are out of place in a book that basically collects the opinions of others. Suffice it to say that, after I finish the edition of the present collection, I will start gathering my thoughts in books that deal directly with the thorny subject.

Meanwhile it will be enough to focus on lesser subjects such sexual degeneracy, feminized nationalists, anti-Nordicism and the thoughts of an European thinker about the racist movement in the United States.

An overly traveled road to extinction

by Hajo Liancius

As a distant observer of the American White Nationalist scene, I am struck by its utter irrelevancy in public discourse outside of being a fund-raising tool for anti-Occidental activists¹⁶ and as a subject of lurid speculation. In part, this distressing situation is a product of the typical pathologies and corruption endemic to counter-culture groups but I am not inclined to cover the endless scandals that have in large part defined the White Nationalist scene during the last fifty years or so. While the character issue and other matters should be approached, the issue of what exactly American Occidental advocacy presently entails in terms of an ideological foundation is of paramount importance.

Currently paleoconservatism dominates what little racist discourse occurs in the States. Given that the mainstream of racist thought in the states since the reconstruction era has been remarkably consistent, it matters little if one refers to it as Americanism, racial populism or racial paleoconservatism in terms addressing its ideological validity. Before considering the present-day applicability of the paleocon doctrine I think a consideration of the golden era of modern American racialism is worthwhile simply because it provides an excellent case study of the consequences of the character issue alluded to earlier as well as the utility of a racially based paleoconservatism as a governing ideology.

The golden age of American racialism coincided with the birth of what is commonly referred to as the Second Klan Era, which was founded by the publisher of *The Jeffersonian* newspaper and U.S. senator Thomas Watson in 1915. Watson built the Klan into a nationwide organization with more than four million members (about 15 percent of the white male Protestant population of the country at the time) that was particularly powerful in the Midwest and Southern states. The influence attained by the Second Klan Era far exceeded the accomplishments of American racialism at any time since as they managed to gain control of state legislatures in Tennessee, Indiana, Oklahoma, and Oregon as well as electing a governor in Indiana and several Congressmen and Senators. Most impressive of

¹⁶ The services provided by white nationalist groups in the U.S. seem to be to generate scary stories published by the ADL/OPP/SPLC etc., which get old Jewish ladies and paranoid urban hipsters to give money to those groups.

all, they managed to heavily influence the Democratic Convention of 1924 and helped get a Klansman on the Supreme Court.

The combination of segregation, constitutionalism, opposition to Southern/Eastern European immigration, Protestant fundamentalism, isolationism and economic populism were all popular causes fully within the mainstream of public social and political thought at the time. Simply put, the Second Klan Era enjoyed a nearly ideal historical context in which to transform America into a society far more reflective of Occidental values. Yet they achieved little in terms of societal reform and lapsed into obscurity very quickly. The reason for this failure was largely a result of the limitations of the paleoconservative ideology they promoted, as will be shown.

The Second Klan Era was largely, with the notable exception of The Black Legion, committed to working within the confines of electoral politics for the purpose of advancing its public policy agenda. That agenda consisted of the preservation of the constitutional order of the day, maintaining the predominance of Europeans of Nordic, Western and Celtic origins in cultural and political terms; restoring Protestant fundamentalism to a place of preeminence, the maintenance of American neutrality, advancing prohibition and advancing the economic populist agenda of the time.

Needless to say, the reelection of Wilson in 1916 resulted in America's subsequent entry into the First World War (as well as numerous imperialistic adventures in Central and South America during the 1920s), and the entry into the League of Nations ended American neutrality and weakened its sovereignty. On the domestic front Klan influence failed to slow the flood of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, the suffragette movement's triumph, the decadence of the 1920s or the rise of the anti-Occidental mass media during the 1930s. In short, they failed to preserve the societal order that defined America at the turn of the century or protect the ethnic and religious interests they held dear despite being given an ideal opportunity to do so.

While the Klan was heavily involved in promoting prohibition and progressive economic policies popular during the first two decades of the 20th century, the passage of such measures happened because they were promoted by popular sentiment across major portions of the political spectrum (including Negroes, organized labor, fundamentalist Protestants and women) as well as the efforts of significant portions of the political establishment that were entirely unsympathetic to the Klan. As a result, it is very unrealistic to view the Second Klan Era as anything more than one of several significant factions promoting progressive reforms and prohibition.

The collapse of the Second Klan Era began in large measure as a result of Stephenson scandal of 1925. Under Stephenson's guidance, Klan membership swelled to 300,000 in the State of Indiana and, in the 1924 elections, Klan-backed candidates won all but one of Indiana's U.S Congressional seats as well as the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and the

Secretary of State. Stephenson was the most charismatic leader the Klan ever had as he was a gifted orator and a popular leader throughout much of the country as well as the Grand Dragon of Indiana which was a major Klan stronghold at the time. Yet all he is remembered for now is the extremely brutal kidnapping, rape and subsequent suicide of Madge Oberholtzer. The resultant media coverage devastated the Klan and turned formerly cordial elite opinion against the organization resulting in a dramatic and rapid decline of its influence and popularity.

In 1936 the kidnapping and murder of Charles Poole and the subsequent crackdown on the Black Legion (a paramilitary offshoot of the Klan active in Illinois, Michigan and Ohio) sped the disintegration of what remained of the Klan forcing its sale in 1939 and it subsequently bankrupted because of tax avoidance in 1944, thereby ending the Second Klan Era and hastening the decline of racially-based paleoconservatism. The lesson provided by the Black Legion is that poorly planned, sporadic political violence can't threaten state power but it does motivate repression and the political marginalization of would-be revolutionaries.

Any post-mortem analysis of the Second Klan Era naturally raises the matter of what would have happened had the rape and subsequent death of Oberholtzer been concealed, or conjecture about how history might have been different had Stephenson been able to control his depraved instincts. Such conjecture doesn't seem fruitful given that sexual psychopaths tend to behave in ways that are incompatible with the rational life of self-sacrifice needed of anyone that aspires to revolutionary political leadership. In light of the savagery directed against Oberholtzer it appears obvious that his bestial nature couldn't be controlled nor concealed indefinitely. His arrest for sexual assault in 1961 after spending decades in prison seems to confirm his unsuitability for life among Occidental people although other aspects of his conduct during the 1920s paint a very troubling portrait of the man as well as the organization that he led.

On a more fundamental level, the problem of the Second Klan Era was metapolitical in nature, which is to say that they ceded the parameters of discourse which predetermined the sorts of policies and tactics they adopted. Accepting the paleoconservative notion of Americans meant that the Second Klan Era accepted contemporary egalitarian notions about democracy while promoting a narrow form of racialism. Practically what this meant was that they hoped to restrict enfranchisement to the old Nordic/Western/Celtic racial base with no meaningful thought given as to how pragmatically exclude the already substantial Southern and Eastern European populations within the confines of universal suffrage, nor how the established party system could be dissuaded from catering to emerging demographics. Long-term Negro demographic trends in the South and Midwest made the Klan's strategy of regional race-based enfranchisement unviable in the long term, which wasn't surprising given the overwhelming financial, institutional and cultural strength of the establishment that dominated the rest of America.

Although an aristocratic remnant survived in the South as late as the 1930s, an adherence to democratic dogma and the economic/social populism of the period meant that the acceptance of the foundations of capitalism negated any consideration of natural hierarchies as a basis for establishing both rights and responsibilities, as well as a means of providing for greater social cohesion. The old Southern aristocracy provided a bulwark against Eastern financial interests in the antebellum and reconstruction eras, making such a choice tactically questionable and ideologically puzzling for an allegedly conservative movement based in the South. However, since no thought at all was given to syndicalism, guildism or corporatism, the Klan was left with populist prescriptions for state-based restraints upon the influence of capital which had proven to be a dead-end by the beginning of the 1930s.

While the Second Klan Era paid homage to the Confederacy, any serious discussion about secession simply didn't exist within its circles at the time. Instead, lots of effort was spent praising constitutionalism resulting in the Klan seeing itself as the standard bearer of a contemporary Americanism rather than as a revolutionary secessionist movement. Unaddressed was the matter of how the constitution failed to stop the transformation of the country into a society dominated by North Eastern plutocrats or how a regional movement like the Klan could formulate a long term defensive strategy against a national leadership animated by a deep malevolence to all that the Klan stood for.

When one considers the obvious unsuitability of its foundations and practical experiences that should have been gleaned from what was then recent history, it is reasonable to presume that the Second Klan Era was content with being a regional force with no long-term strategy for remaining relevant. It appears instead that they hoped that somehow state-level autonomy could be maintained with current societal trends.

A consideration of contemporary written material clearly indicates that the Second Klan Era lacked any metapolitical foundation or coherent ideology but instead was a manifestation of incoherent but well-intended sentiments opposed to Occidental dispossession in the American South and Midwest. In a practical sense, the Second Klan Era was purely defensive and reactive and destined to fail even if Stephenson's sexual psychopathy would have been concealed or repressed.

The ideology promoted by the Klan and like-minded groups since the Reconstruction Era is extremely similar to the ideology promoted by the mainstream of American racist groups such as *Stormfront*, *American Renaissance*, *Liberty Lobby*, *VDARE*, the *Council of Conservative Citizens*, various Klan factions, the *American Nationalist Union*, the recently disbanded *National Vanguard*¹⁷ and several other organizations as well.

¹⁷ National Vanguard was founded by William Pierce but it degenerated after read Pierce's death. (Note of the Ed.)

Given the failure of paleoconservatism to preserve Occidental interests in America within the nearly ideal historical context that presented itself in the Second Klan Era, honest men should question the suitability of the ideology within the current era even if most in the White Nationalist community refuse to do so, as has been the case for nearly ninety years.

As an adherent of the Revisionist Integralism/Organicism school, my critique of paleoconservatism is metapolitical in nature rather than drawn from a historicist perspective or bound by a narrowly conceived ideological preference.¹⁸ As such, I would maintain that a foundational consideration of the paleoconservative disposition is needed.

Fundamentally, paleoconservatism should be about the preservation of that which makes a people or a nation-state unique. Yet within the American context that uniqueness has unfortunately come to mean classical liberalism, capitalism, constitutionalism and a less permissive form of Christianity.

¹⁸ Like its Iberian/French/Italian predecessors, the Revisionist Integralism/Organicism school is principally concerned with the goal of societal unity as a means for the preservation and expansion of the nation which is understood as a product of the confluence between a homogenous folk and the land it inhabits. History is principally the record of how the national organism comes to define itself in experiential terms and produce a communal entity reflective of providential will.

Both schools see the innate value of the individual realized within the context of a communion with ancestors, decedents and the living in which transcendent responsibilities to the values of Permanence shape collective and individual identity.

Like its predecessors, the school maintains that economic, political and spiritual matters can't be seen as distinct from each other as the coherent expression of a nation is a prerequisite for survival in an anarchic world of rival nations and forces antithetical to all nations. Both perceive folkways as an expression of what is termed the associative/formative drive or *verbunden Bildungstrieb* of a nation and that state legitimacy is a product of how well it reflects and maintains a communion of ancestors, the living and descendants of a folk.

The Revisionist Integralism/Organicism differs from its predecessors in that it perceives human social existence primarily in terms of folk-specific conflicts between foundational elements that animate a society and how attempts to resolve such conflicts further national uniqueness and survivability. While historically Integralism often wasn't explicitly concerned with the biologic foundation of national organicism, Revisionist Integralism/Organicism attributes the associative formative drive of a folk as well as the culture produced by it as unintelligible outside of a racial context.

Likewise, cultural and biologic decline is seen as inseparable tendencies although the mechanism that initiates the decline is seen as resulting from an interaction between the inherent contradictions with the application of folk's *verbunden Bildungstrieb* and Mosca and Pareto's understanding of elite degeneration. The practical resolution of the contradictions mentioned above usually involves blended elements of corporative, syndicalist, guildist and distributivist prescriptions within an explicit biologic and revolutionary conservative context broadly compatible with the formulations of the original Integralist movements.

The single greatest flaw with such an ideology is that the things it wishes to preserve are already dead. The constitutional republic of the founders so revered by the paleocons is like any other legal doctrine: it can't help but die along with the societal conditions that gave rise to it.

It died when the states ceased to be sovereign entities able to withdraw from the union. The ordinal constructs that succeeded it are as alien to the vision of the 18th century liberals that created the constitution as the founders compared to the typical Obama voter or Howard Stern fan. When American paleocons speak of an American Order they incorrectly presume that a consistent legal and governing doctrine upon which public life is ordered has suffered degradations over time while still being salvageable and relevant by means that have never been meaningfully articulated. Such a view ignores the legal doctrines of the Confederated Republic era or simply presumes it to be a consistent, logical precursor to a perfected legal doctrine that began in 1789 and degraded to a major extent sometime after 1861 yet still represents an ideal that can be restored via the subverted institutions that have perverted America beyond recognition if some unspecified populist course of action is taken by a population wholly removed from the societal framework that gave birth to it.

In philosophical terms a major challenge to the notion of ordinal continuity so beloved of American paleocons and the angst about the decline of the republic is the reality that history has thus far given birth to six distinct American ordinal eras. With the exception of the First Federal Republic, the fundamental reordering of American life has involved a commixture of constitutional amendments and the practical nullification of constitutional rule via legislation, executive orders and the natural Dissipative effects inherent in liberalism.¹⁹

The paleoconservative notion of the American Order is premised upon an institutional and civic societal construct that hasn't existed for several generations. Instead, it is more accurate to see American history defined by ordinal epochs characterized in terms of the degree to which Occidental folkways and mores within society had been dominating, are

¹⁹ The concept of Dissipationism is an aspect of a broader metapolitical *weltanschauung* known as Integralism or Organicism and its successor movement, Revisionist Integralism/Organicism. Dissipationism is a force that is manifested as a range of social movements animated by a utilitarian reason that serves the ascendance of the Transience ideal. In practical terms Dissipationism is appositional to Burkian notions of prejudice, prudence and civilization as a consequence of biologic uniqueness formed by the confluence of genetics and geography which has historical progression and culture as it's byproduct.

Examples of expressions of Dissipationism include feminism, globalism, egalitarianism, anti-racism, organized expressions of libertine lifestyles, liberalism and trans-humanism. Transience as an ideal is effected when social relations have wholly, or nearly so, dispensed with any sense of communion between the descendants and ancestors of the living in favor of social propositions that are not resultant from anything uniquely attributable to a genetically distinct folk.

in decline, or nonexistent. Within the American context Permanence had always been undermined by the Degenerative aspects inherent in classical Liberalism. When Dissipationist forces became ascendant to such an extent that the order of the area became fundamentally changed, a new, more degenerate order with a new set of systemic contradictions comes into being giving birth to a new ordinal era.²⁰

In the briefest of all possible terms these ordinal eras are:

1.- The Confederated Republic (1781-1788). This period was characterized by an extremely decentralized and weak confederation of effectively sovereign agrarian states whose cooperative association formed a republic defined by the radical liberalism of the late 18th century and an expansionist, racial supremacy led by Occidentals. This order was Generative in nature.

2.- The First Federalist Republic (1789-1861). This period was characterized by strong sub-national governments that voluntarily became part of a federated national state defined by a less radical form of liberalism and an expansionist racial supremacy led by Occidentals. Although agrarian economic interests dominated a large portion of the country, industrial elites had obtained substantial financial and political power during this era. This order was Generative in nature.

3.- The Second Federalist Republic (1861-1912). This period was characterized by sub-national governments with high degrees of autonomy involuntarily forced to remain part of a federated national state with significant centralization of power, typical of 19th century liberalism. For most of this period America was still defined in terms of an expansionist racial supremacy led by Occidentals although an ascendant Jewish minority held major influence in media, finance and government. This period was also characterized by experiments with imperialism and a decline of agrarian societies and a typically liberal consolidation of wealth. This order was characterized by a tension between Regenerative and Dissipationist forces with dominion of the former, but in decline.

4.- The Third Federalist Republic (1913-1954). This period was characterized by sub-national governments with significant but declining autonomy consistent with the progression of 20th century liberalism. America was for most of this ordinal era defined in terms of a preservationist racialism that had fully abandoned the Celtic/Nordic/Western core identity in favor of a pan-European ideal held together by propositional nationalism. Although still nominally led by Occidentals, an ascendant Jewish minority held a major (or arguably a dominant) position in media, finance and government. This period was also

²⁰ The concept of systemic contradictions within the Revisionist Integralist/Organic school posits that all political doctrines and the societal constructs that create them have inherent contradictions that are an expression of the folkish character that produced them. These contradictions consequently give rise to alienation within individuals, a class or society at large which lessens societal cohesion giving rise to Dissipative forces.

characterized by experiments with imperialism, the establishment of Chesterton's Servile State, and the ascendancy of globalism. This order was characterized by a tension between Regenerative and Dissipationist forces with the latter ascendant.

5.- The First Post-Federal Republic (1954-2001). This period was characterized by sub-national governments with moderate and declining autonomy and centralization of power consistent with typical late 20th century liberalism. America was for most of this period defined in Cultural Bolshevik terms of racial nihilism, globalism and Chesterton's Servile State. America's ruling elite by this time was characterized by a mixture of racist Asian, Mestizo and Negro factions as well as deracinated Occidentals subservient to Jewish power. This order principally represented Transience with Regenerative forces in steep decline.

6.- The Second Post-Federal Republic (2001 to the present). This period is characterized by sub-national governments without any meaningful degree of autonomy forced to remain part of a federated national state with a far greater centralization of power consistent with typical 21st century liberalism. The current American order is defined as an increasingly militant expression of Cultural Bolshevism which is manifested in terms of racial nihilism, familial collapse, globalism and an increasingly common form of authoritarianism created by the merger of finance and statist authority. America's current ruling elites differ from that of the previous order in terms of the militancy used in the service of the destruction of America's Occidental remnant and its growing insolvency. This order represents the triumph of Transience with Regenerative forces playing a negligible societal role.

The essence of the paleocon perspective on the constitution is that it can somehow resurrect a classically inspired form of liberalism while ignoring the reality that the foundational elements of Liberalism are naturally Dissipative. Instead of representing a force of Continuance the constitution has been reinterpreted and restructured to serve successive orders whose values are fully divorced from those created by those that founded their nation state.²¹

One endlessly hears commentary about the sacred glory of the constitution and debate among paleocons over its relevance in various contemporary controversies. Constitutionalists at best ignore and often celebrate that the constitution failed to protect

²¹ The diametrical ideal to Transience is Permanence which when effected entails the ordering of social relations resulting from the confluence of genetics and geography which define history so as to provide a continuity of uniqueness and purpose to a genetically distinct folk expressed in terms of an organic state and society. Forces that are Generative are in effect when the ideal of Permanence is in ascendance or dominates social discourse. When the Transience ideal is in ascendance or dominates social discourse the oppositional forces are said to be Regenerative.

Occidental children from literally being militarily forced to attend publicly funded indoctrination centers extolling the virtues of miscegenation while being physically abused by racial aliens.

In fact the constitution made of such travesties a celebrated basis of decades of legal doctrine. Although the constitution failed to prevent Occidentals in America from being dispossessed by an endless tidal wave of flotsam from the third world, it has granted the invaders legal equality with those that created a nation state. The constitution failed to prevent America from becoming a client-state of Israel just as it failed to prevent the rise of Bush's Orwellian surveillance state.

The constitution has been powerless to stop the ascension of a multi-billion dollar industry based upon sexual debasement and an economic order in which tens of millions of Americans live the lives of serfs for global enterprises which buy legislators, presidents and judges. Although Constitutionalism has done absolutely nothing to prevent cultural Bolshevism dominating American life, it has given legal license to every manner of social malignancy one can imagine. And yet for more than one hundred and fifty years American paleocons cling to the fantasy that the very same legal/governmental doctrine that gutted the republic they love will somehow restore it back to the halcyon days of the 1950s, the early 1900s, the antebellum South, 1789 or whatever nostalgic fantasy they aspire to.

The reason that such a tragedy has come to pass is because such an outcome is a consequence of the individualistic nature of liberalism without which cultural Bolshevism simply would not have been possible.

What little remains of the paleocon movement is committed to racial egalitarianism and the notion that Occidental civilization can be perpetuated by races other than the one that created it. Mainstream paleocons believe that racial aliens can be assimilated to accept and even advance Occidental culture ignoring the realities of racial psychometrical differences and evolutionary psychology, and historical evidence to the contrary. In short, they embrace a major cause of Occidental decline (multi-racialism) and even uphold it as an example of enlightened Western values while bemoaning the societal disintegration it engenders.

Although racially conscious paleocons have been relegated to the margins of political and cultural discourse for several decades, they have continued to embrace classical liberalism because they fail to understand that the liberalism of the 18th century has cultural Bolshevism as its logical consequence.²²

²² Within the context of Revisionist Integralist/Organicist thought America's radical liberalism of the Confederated and the First Republican orders owe their regenerative qualities only partly to the biologic qualities of the colonizers and the positive aspects of liberalism specific to a given era and place. The vitalism of the first two republican eras is owed in equal measure to a combination of the Paleolithic condition of the American aboriginal folk dispossessed by Occidental colonizers, the geographic isolation

In part this stems from the egalitarianism and individualism expressed in the American constitution. America as a nation state can't be understood to be an organic national entity in any meaningful sense of the term since it was not the product of the confluence of blood and soil and the folkways produced from such a dynamic. Rather, the old republics came about as an expression of the liberal idealism of the late 18th century and as such they exemplified a rejection of Occidental traditionalism with its emphasis upon communal responsibilities, privileges and hierarchy which are the foundational elements of Occidental social existence. The afore-mentioned confluence animates a society by defining its strengths and contradictions as well as determining what attempts are made to resolve said conflicts from the standpoint of furthering national uniqueness and survivability.


Liberalism is expressed economically as capitalism and socially as atomistic individualism.

Restorative forces are incompatible with capitalism because social interactions are determined largely by financial prowess and conformity to fleeting consumerist fads. Within such an environment, communing with ancestors and descendants becomes impossible when individuals can at best think in terms of family welfare and the occasional act of charity while typically they become defined by crass materialism or merely serfs living at the edge of subsistence.

A notion often promoted in mainstream paleocon and White Nationalist circles is that modern day capitalism (often termed super-capitalism) is somehow substantially different than capitalism of whatever era they romanticize. Such a notion is absurd because it fails to recognize the antisocial nature inherent in capitalism.

Such destructiveness is demonstrated by the accumulation of financial power via usury which results in an extreme consolidation of wealth distorting so-called market forces, allowing oligopolies and/or monopolies to control markets and limit competition. In so doing they further consolidate their economic power by creating an economy in which purchasing decisions, competition and chances for individual enrichment suffer. Oligopolies and/or monopolies also subvert supposedly free markets and democratic institutions when they inevitably discover that legislation, and political parties and public office holders can be purchased as easily as any other commodity.

and natural resources of the New World and the limited technological options then available to capital acting upon its naturally Dissipative tendencies.



The Worship of Mammon by Evelyn De Morgan (1909)

In effect, highly concentrated capital is able to nullify popular will via well-funded lobbying campaigns, dramatically manipulative electoral campaigns and molding public opinion to suit plutocratic interests. In practical terms the so-called private sector can be just as an effective oppressor as an omnipotent state although some would argue that the engineering of consent via a highly concentrated, corporate media creates a propasphere²³ that is far more capable of controlling dissent than any state could.

Paleocon economic thought is like mainstream libertarianism in that they both prefer to believe the flagrant lie that capital is not inevitably concentrated and/or that such concentration does not distort the market nor cause, social havoc.

Surveying the formally Occidental portions of the world makes it apparent that the political power of concentrated finance often cannot be overcome by regulatory regimes or tax policies consistent with the current liberal gestalt because the means by which such policies are crafted are owned by the very interests they seek to regulate. To the extent that various Western states have implemented social-democratic inspired controls over capital, the same dynamics of alienation remain in part because excessive statist regulation and taxes have simply shifted the power of capital to the state rather than to society at large. Statist regulation of capital is ineffective as transnational finance has far more power culturally and politically than any nation state can possibly muster within its own borders.

²³ Propasphere: A sphere of propaganda. (Note of the Ed.)

This unfortunate reality has been the case from the earliest days of the East India Trading company and remains so today.

Racially aware paleocons are cognizant of the reality that culture is a biologically based construct and that demographics determine the destiny of nations. Unfortunately they fail to realize that capitalism shapes demographics to suit the interests of those able to control capital.

When racial paleocons look upon the Antebellum South under the soft, uncritical glow of an unfocused nostalgic yearning for that which never was, they choose to ignore the enslavement of Europeans and the misery that was inflicted upon free White men forced to compete with slave labor. In the case of Rhodesian and South African segregation and the concentration of political power in White hands did not translate into economic security for working-class Occidentals who were forced to compete with far more abundant Negroid labor while paying higher taxes to support parallel social services for two separate races. Elsewhere in the Western World slave labor came to be supplanted by an endless supply of low-cost alien labor when it became technologically and politically possible to do so during the second half of the 20th century.

If by some miracle the racial paleocons of the likes of *American Renaissance* take power tomorrow, bringing back segregation and ending the influx of alien peoples, the twin forces of third world fertility and capitalism's need for ever cheaper labor will do away with whatever demographic gains the racial paleocons may achieve in short order. Because a nation's demographics determine its destiny, any such a White Nationalist democracy will be faced with disenfranchised alien masses that will have common cause with the plutocrats whose economic logic demands a system highly similar to what the formerly Occidental world has now.

While mainstream and racial paleocons alike pay homage to Burke's famous call for self-determination from Madras to Manchester, they ignore that the traditionalism of both will perish when left to so-called market forces. Since capitalism views individuals as any other commodity, why should one expect tradition to be anything more than a marketing tool, discarded when something else can be sold with a greater return on investment? The same market forces which imported slaves nearly two centuries ago for higher profits while taking bread from the mouths of White laborers exports Occidental jobs for higher profits today.

With rare exceptions, rebellion within the context of a consumerist society has nothing to do with upholding traditionalistic values. Instead, uniqueness is based upon purchasing items which convey a pseudo-rebellion likely to win approval from one's peers or reaffirm the carnality and nihilism sanctioned by the media.

Occidentals must confront the discomfoting reality that we are faced with a relentless marginalization and a looming extinction for the benefit of an elite that hold us in contempt, rather than as individual members of a transcendent order in which commonality of purpose extends beyond material advancement and fashionableness. When a societal consensus is based upon ever fluxuating fads and the need to produce wealth for others with ever greater efficiency. Promiscuity, homosexuality, substance abuse, familial disintegration and delinquency will follow.²⁴

Capitalism, and the individualism which gave birth to the classical liberalism of yore, and the liberty so cherished by those that claim to be conservatives, have seen the legal doctrines and institutions they cherish transformed into mere tools for competing interest groups and ascendant racial entities seeking to impose themselves over groups of individuals lacking any sense of common identity and purpose. Such an outcome is to be expected as Occidental peoples have had any sense of organically derived sense of purpose torn from them by design. Occidentals of all nations have no sense of an inherent uniqueness and value extending across countless generations of the past and those yet to be born, and are doomed to extinction as long as such a mindset persists. Occidentals merely produce greater profits for a global plutocracy which uses those returns to fund our displacement with no thought of communal purpose beyond our grandchildren (if that).

Surveying the decaying remnants of the Occidental world after more than two centuries of Liberalism in action has, without exception, meant cultural devolution, the rise of the anti-culture and our demographic decline culminating in the apocalypse slowly unfolding upon us. Segregationist efforts and slavery have uniformly failed to preserve a liberalism meant to serve Occidental humanity because of the inerrant contradictions within liberalism necessitate either continued Devolution or Restorative revolution. Realizing the uniformity of the Dissipative effects of liberalism upon Occidental societies, the only sensible conclusion one can reach is that liberalism cannot be fine-tuned or reformed into a Restorative force. We will not vote our way out of Annihilation and our tormentors won't simply collapse, allowing a return to some halcyon era that never was. A viable attempt at a Restorative revolution has never been based upon liberalism because liberalism as an ideal intrinsically serves Transience.

²⁴ Alienation within the Revisionist Integralist/Organicist context refers not to the Marxist use of the term but rather to a process by which individuals, social groups or entire societies become disassociated from the values of Permanence.

Alienation is a product of the anti-culture in which societies and the constituents that comprise them cease to maintain a communion with the land and as an integral component of current, past and coming generations with a common purpose and identity. The forming of identity on the basis of shared banalities in the form of propasphere generated sports or media consumption present the most obvious and ubiquitous manifestations of alienation although in some instances thematic strains within such unwholesome diversions can be harnessed into efforts that have some utility to the Restorative cause.

Given that mainstream as well as racial paleocons lack the fortitude to realize the corrosive effects of capitalism and atomistic individualism upon what remains of the liberal democratic order, they cannot help but bemoan the demise of our traditions—while hoping that institutions controlled by racial aliens and deracinated Occidentals will once again serve the vision of the liberals of the late 18th century. A return to the liberalism of ages past presumes an electoral awakening of masses of lemmings motivated by gut and groin. Since history and current experience proves otherwise the continued paleocon adherence to such a fantasy demonstrates a Fourierian contempt for reality every bit as unreal as skull shapes being explained by Boasian anthropology.

A legal code is nothing more than a mechanism for articulating and balancing competing interests for the greater good of a society, as reflected within the confines of texts recognized as reflecting some transcendent truth. For a collection of texts to have such authority depends upon a nation being defined in terms of a people with a sense of common purpose, history and destiny. To pretend that such an authority can be instilled in a fractious collection of rival cultures bound by force and avarice (as is the case in the post-Occidental West) simply cannot hold up to even a mildly honest bout of cognizance.

The vast material disparities and attendant political/societal dispossession we suffer should be seen as an inevitable consequence of capital becoming ever more focused resulting in the amplification of the social and economic Hobbesian struggle of all against all. Given that paleocons have chosen to accept the foundational elements that have gutted our civilization and will continue to do so, it is sensible to conclude that constitutionalism has no chance of reviving Burke's proud submission to the responsibilities of class and providence revealed in custom. Instead, recent generations have inherited the negation of those things, resulting in the end of common identity and purpose which has been replaced by the current anti-culture abhorred by all who reject the modern crapulence of liberalism.

What now is termed paleoconservatism is simply a sentimental attachment to the vestigial institutions of a largely mythical and deceased liberalism. Paleoconservatism is in practice nothing more than the collective delusion of viewing an apparition as a viable basis for restoring society to an idealized past.

Raspail is right when he sees us as Hermit Crabs inhabiting the bounty of an ancestry we neither build upon, preserve, appreciate nor recognize. Instead they identify with a romanticized concept of institutions and doctrines that once gave prosperity within a highly unique historical and demographic context which they refuse to understand. That such a context also conflated license for freedom making our current decrepitude inevitable is also ignored. Paleocons of all sorts as well as libertarians have done so partly out of ignorance and nostalgia, but also out of cowardice. The cowardice I speak of is that what they imagine to be prudence is nothing more than a hope—in opposition to reason

that submission will ingratiate them to those that loath them and control the institutions that destroyed the ideals held dear so as to be co-opted by their tormentors. In the end all the paleocons of any description can hope for is the demented fantasy that, contrary to evidence and reason, revolutionary change can be avoided by merely fine tuning the legal code; withering the state, praying more fervently, or that assimilation will magically transform aliens into Occidentals as we fade as an anthropological curiosity.

Such a perspective is a biological and ideological distraction the Occidental world hasn't been able to afford for several generations. A genuine conservatism, given the current demographic and institutional context, must be revolutionary in its rejection of the foundational assumptions of liberalism. Paleoconservatism and libertarianism never have and will never rescue a decadent, deracinated people from oblivion, nor even have made a credible attempt at doing so.

By contrast National Revolutionary doctrine has done so several times during the last century. Occidental man requires a revolutionary traditionalism totally divorced from liberalism. Anything else is merely an overly traveled road to the extinction of Occidental humanity.

The West's Darkest Hour, August 10, 2013

Editor's note:

Capitalism and Christianity aside, many American white nationalists tolerate out-of-the-closet homosexuals in their conferences, radio shows and webzines, some of them even pro-“gay” (a Newspeak term) activists.

Greg Johnson is editor in chief of *Counter-Currents Publishing*: a webzine, publisher and online store associated with the racist American New Right. Hajo Lialucius' next essay is a response to Johnson's plea for homosexual marriage.

White nationalists and the sexual revolution

Most white nationalists are merely lefties who, understandably, loathe Jews and niggers, etc. They want the 1960s (sex, drugs & rock'n'roll, abortion, absence of any duties, etc.) without the unpleasantness of the aforementioned groups in their midst. The herd needs a great deal of culling.

—Patrick Reis

On homosexual “marriage”

by Hajo Liancius

Johnson and I both agree that homosexuality is natural if by natural we mean that homosexuals have always existed in human societies. The problem with this notion is that what makes a behavior natural within a societal context is better understood in terms of its effects upon a society’s ability to biologically thrive and advance culturally rather than just its mere existence. In practical terms I perceive behaviors to be socially natural to the extent that they secure the physical existence of a people and the promotion of that which makes a people unique. Given that, the toleration of recreational non-reproductive heterosexuality and miscegenation divorces the living generation from those that gave us life while denying an environment in which Occidentals can have an organic society.

Homosexuality is like recreational and non-reproductive heterosexuality and miscegenation and the widespread social acceptance of such behaviors is an indication that Occidental civilization has been replaced by an atomistic view of social relations. In practical terms all such predilections are driven by selfish, physical pleasure divorced from any sense of hierarchal responsibilities as well as a denial by the individual of any sense of purpose: as a being that is endowed with a responsibility toward his own folk or the development of an organic civilization.

Johnson says that “the idea that changing marriage laws can change heteronormativity is simply false” is, to me, a remarkable claim. Rather, I would suggest that the acceptance of the legal equality of a recreational and non-reproductive predilection that has been accompanied by a massive effort to promote such behavior as a lifestyle is at odds with the physical preservation of our people while advancing the Cultural Bolshevik establishment to greater strengths. I also can’t help but notice that the dismantling of anti miscegenation laws and the dismantling of any legal prohibitions on sexual conduct and the consequences in the form of legalizing or even subsidizing abortion have also been accompanied by massive and prolonged efforts to normalize that which has promoted our demographic destruction. In short, all sexual libertine tendencies represent a unified front dedicated to our destruction and they should be addressed as such rather than being selectively ignored or condoned.

While the promotion of yet another socially and biologically destructive lifestyle is deemed by Johnson to be “an unimportant issue from the point of view of white demographics” the reality is what we are talking about is the normalization of yet another recreational and non-reproductive sexual behavior that is promoted by our enemies because it advances our demographic decline. Since homosexuality is being successfully marketed to our youth as a hip, trendy lifestyle morally equal, if not superior, to traditional mores it is sensible to view attempts of mainstreaming homosexuality as simply another demographic tool used to destroy us. Johnson wrote: “During the whole period that marriage and family life have been decaying, homosexuals have not been allowed to marry, and marriage has been defined as a union of a man and a woman. In other words, marriage and family life have declined with their heteronormativity entirely intact. Therefore, heterosexuals bear the primary blame for the decline of marriage and the family.”

What Johnson seems to be asking is that we ignore certain manifestations of degeneracy and biologic decline while attempting to enact reforms that are unviable politically because of the climate of decay fostered by the broader trend of degeneracy being promoted by the homosexual movement and other allied forces that seek our destruction. How exactly heterosexuals in general bear the primary blame for the decline of marriage and family life rather than viewing said decay as an expression of the destruction of our society resulting from the power and institutional adroitness of our enemies isn’t addressed. Instead, that we are asked to accept such a notion seems to be analogous to saying that the primary blame for the subjugation of our people rests with Occidentals rather than those that have dispossessed us. I would maintain that Pareto’s “circulation of elite” provides a better account for our dismal state of affairs and that the long march through the institutions provides a better perspective on the collapse of Occidental marriage and family life than does the assertion that heterosexuals are the guilty party—and the less than logical jump that we shouldn’t be concerned with the political power of the homosexual movement and what it means for the Occidental remnant.

That is not to say that Johnson isn’t overwhelmingly correct in his summation of what is wrong with the establishment or that his suggestions for reversing our demographic destruction are anything but sound. However, to suggest that opposition to an obviously socially destructive trend promoted by our enemies isn’t worth opposing yet advocating the pursuit of reforms (that simply can’t happen because of the advanced state of our societal decay that has been produced by the same forces that are promoting homosexuality) seems misguided.

Given the reality that the main-streaming of homosexuality has advanced the aims of Cultural Bolshevism and demographic decline among Occidentals, I can’t find much sympathy with Johnson’s notion that the advance of homosexuality among our youth should be greeted with moderate disappointment and support. Since such behavior is simply another manifestation of the death of tradition and our physical future, I find such lukewarm condemnations no different than expressing support and disappointment about

miscegenation or any other form of selfish and destructive recreational sex. If heterosexuals are to be blamed for our current cultural miasma, such blame should be apportioned to the extent that such weak, pseudo-criticisms are accepted by the advocates of our people. Accepting or not being concerned with an aspect of that which destroys us while attempting to resist our destruction in a broader context is every bit as much of a dead-end in all senses as is the *faux right* we justly condemn.

After the above comment was approved in the webzine, Liaucius added a second comment:

Mr. Johnson, thank you for giving my comments the benefit of your thoughtful reply. My last two attempts to post retort haven't worked so hopefully this one will make it. Here is my response:

As I am a Zyrian²⁵ and the situation here has little relation to that of America, I feel that some of the differences between us may be accounted for with a bit of explanation on my part. As an integralist I don't see homosexuality as biologically sub-optimal [Johnson's term] but instead as a biological and spiritual element within the Dissipationist movement. It would appear that you are speaking of mere homosexuality which is like autoandrophilia, biastophilia, coprophilia and paedophilia which have always been noxious aberrations within the occidental world but rarely have they been serious forces of Dissipationism. The homosexual movement is something rather different as it represents the logical development of Dissipationism and its elevation to a protected, fashionable, legally recognized and privileged social force with the goal of destroying any possible occidental restoration by redefining family away from the cornerstone of any civilization worthy of the name into vile inversions of those things.

The various manifestations of Dissipationism (such as egalitarianism, liberalism, anti-racism, class warfare, feminism and recreational heterosexualism) have incrementally instilled the current anti-culture and have given rise to the homosexual movement. The casual dismissal of the reordering of family to suit Dissipationism is a rejection of permanence and wholly at odds with occidental restoration and integralism.

Homosexuality is atomistic individual liberalism taken to its nihilistic, yet logical conclusion in service of our own destruction. The homosexual movement is a particularly serious biologic threat as a result of its trendiness among our youth and its institutional strength.

It is said that family life is dead and that as a result the latest form of societal destruction—that is to say, homosexuality—should be ignored and the more common

²⁵ People in the northeastern European part of Russia. The squared brackets in this article are interpolations of the editor. (Note of the Ed.).

forms of sexual decrepitude should command our attention. This is a convenient, lazy prescription for selective inaction coupled with a wish that the broader forces of Dissipationism can be reversed, and reflects an unwillingness to understand and act in a way that represents surrender to the metapolitical realm of our enemies.

Yet even within the degenerate post-occidental world, relatively healthy families are still common and any potentially regenerative elements will overwhelmingly arise from them as they represent the only element of organicism left. The prescription that the homosexual movement's campaign against marriage should be greeted with disappointment and *blasé* support is simply capitulation disguised as pragmatism. Not recognizing the homosexual movement within its broader context—as has often been seen within this discourse, while laying the blame for societal disintegration on heterosexuals—is fully analogous to blaming occidentals for our dispossession.

As to what I suppose is commonly termed “the right”—be it of the neo, paleo, transhumanist or white nationalist varieties—, they jointly represent, at best, a healthy if vague disposition based upon foundationalisms that have easily been co-opted to serve Dissipationism or an ineffectual and constantly retreating *faux resistance*. As I've detailed the specifics in metapolitical and operational terms elsewhere, I'll leave those larger issues for another time.

Liaucius' final comment about the Johnson affair was not meant to be published at Counter-Currents, only on The West's Darkest Hour:

In the past I had heard plenty of claims that Greg Johnson was a homosexual but ignored them because of the great virtues found in much of his writings and because I believed that I shared a broadly similar ideological framework with him.

When I first read Johnson's essay on homosexual marriage I wasn't concerned since I presumed that he was engaging in an intellectual exercise that was sincere, if deeply problematic, which didn't reflect a defense of homosexuality or an endorsement of homosexual marriage. What I did find worrying was that self-identified homosexuals defended the article along with several apparently healthily Occidental advocates who overlooked numerous, serious flaws with the rationales behind Johnson's missive. These concerns had been partly alleviated by Johnson's polite response to my initial retort although I was starting to realize that the ideological chasm between Johnson and myself was far wider than I had previously thought. Still, it seemed that he was dealing with the topic in good faith and I certainly wasn't ready to view him as a sodomite or harboring a *Weltanschauung* at odds with the cause of Occidental restoration.

My second retort was met with the standard Dissipationist tactic of decrying me as a reactionary combined with a cursory bit about how I was a *faux tough*, ceding the

metapolitical ground to our enemies and doomed to failure. My subsequent attempts at responding were met with censorship and the thread being closed before Johnson created a new essay praising undefined moderates for accepting the soundness of homosexual civil unions and decrying those that disagree as hateful. Seeing an alleged Occidental advocate parroting left-wing agitating was clearly a sign that something was radically amiss with Greg Johnson.

When D. McCulloch correctly pointed out that—:

Marriage is the working out of metaphysical truth. That truth (as traditionalists see it, broadly) is in the incompleteness of either the masculine or the feminine principle instantiated by itself. We marry and then work together in order to become whole, i.e., to become fully human, for want of a simpler term. It is an effort to restore, in a minor way, the primordial condition. Society sanctions that effort for the dignity and fulfillment of both sexes. At bottom, the reasons for marriage, as it were, are entirely metaphysical. All of those sodomite questions and challenges for which you think there are no good answers, are, if fact, easy to answer if you understand the principles involved: the principles that you are supposed to be defending. So, no. The agenda of the forces of dissolution, i.e., anti-tradition, including the radical politicized sodomites, should be opposed in its entirety with no quarter given.

—the extent of Johnson’s reply was to dismiss what was said as “made up rationales for justifying coupling” which demonstrates a shallow, mis-educated view regarding traditionalism and an open contempt for Occidental folkways and mores that in no respect differ from any generic proponent of our destruction. Interestingly, D. McCulloch was permitted an elegant reply [at *Counter-Currents*]. That Johnson lacked the ability or willingness to counter such an obvious truth wasn’t a surprise to me. More importantly, the exchange confirmed that Johnson’s thinking on this topic is fundamentally in opposition to Occidental renewal and that he mimics the rhetoric of our enemies and the reasoning of the American Supreme Court.

Donar van Holland capably demolished Johnson’s argument that “couplings” should be considered strictly in terms of the *prima facie* position that allows marriage to be divorced from reproduction. As expected, Johnson didn’t even acknowledge van Holland’s position but focuses upon legalistic sophistry and the notion that all biologically unproductive “couplings” are functionally equivalent because he says so.

In essence, one is concerned with Occidental humanity to the extent that one seeks to preserve and strengthen that which makes our folk unique. Promoting the legal and institutional recognition of “homosexual couplings” can’t serve such an aim even if family life has been utterly decimated as Johnson claims. Realistically speaking, Johnson is wrong as tens of millions of healthy families exist in the Occidental world; so a central element of his argument is fallacious.

He never really provided any support for his contention that the decline in family life is the fault of heterosexuals, yet even if one accepts that assertion he still provides no reason to believe that accepting the institutionalization of homosexuality can benefit our people. In fact, the alleged utility of such a policy is left unmentioned let alone supported.

As to what Johnson describes as “heteronormativity,” it is true that it can’t be undermined insofar as it’s natural in every meaningful sense of the term and will always appeal to most people. Regarding the homosexual movement in social/tribal and biologic terms (which is what those of us that care about the preservation of our people should be focusing upon), it’s detrimental for all the reasons detailed by myself and others. Johnson recognizes that his prescriptions for strengthening real marriage aren’t viable in the present clime yet he promotes the agenda of the homosexual movement which is detrimental to our people making one doubt his motivations and/or his intellectual foundations.

Is Johnson a homosexual? I don’t know and I don’t think it matters since regardless of how he lives he perceives that the very building blocks of any civilization worthy of the name (i.e., families) can be divorced from biology. He attempts to reconstruct marriage in legalistic-institutional terms which only make sense within the context of deracinated, social atoms that “couple” purely because it fulfills individual needs. That any “coupling” should be accepted socially and legally as equally valid as heterosexual marriage reflects a Dissipationist rather than an Occidental way of thinking that must be condemned.

In short, Johnson has demonstrated that he has fully embraced a key aspect of Dissipationism to the point of adopting rhetoric indistinguishable from any generic libertarian or leftist establishment proponent, meaning that he can’t be seen as an Occidental advocate.

From the editor's desk

Our most sacred institution



The subject of the virtual abolition of Marriage is, to my mind, more serious than the Jewish problem; and it is no coincidence that most white nationalists focus on the external enemy—Jews—instead of looking at the mirror.

During pre-Christian times Nordics began emigrating in wave after wave heading south. The original Romans, themselves the descendants of one of these waves, would later refer to the German-Scandinavian area as *vagina gentium*, the womb of white nations. Also, the land which ultimately comprised Russia ought to be hugely significant for us because it included the Caucasus area, the original source of the “Indo-European” (Caucasian) peoples.

What pained me the most while reading both William Pierce’s and Arthur Kemp’s stories of the white race is that Europe’s vagina was closed and raped into the Asiatic gene pool

in the course of the Asiatic invasions. After those interminable invasions that lasted centuries the Caucasus area ceased to be the womb of the Nordish peoples. “It was perhaps the single most important racial genocide in history” wrote Kemp.

The aggressor was external of course. But during my lifespan I have witnessed the destruction of whites *by whites* on a scale no seen since the Mongolian invasions. With reproduction levels below the minimum replacement of 2.1 per family, we, not the Huns or Genghis Khan’s hordes, have closed the womb through the so-called sexual liberation movement, feminism, the pill, the legalization of abortion, the empowerment of women, mixed marriages, and the de-stigmatization of homosexuality.

It is my hope that, after the dollar crashes and Western society falls into utter chaos—and, thanks to the laws of social entropy, ethno-states are formed at both sides of the Atlantic—, Roger Devlin’s dream to re-institute heterosexual marriage will become reality.

If our civilization is under the grip of antinatural mores, especially the belief that non-discrimination on race, gender and sexual orientation is the highest moral value, when sexual values are transvalued back to their normal state our women will be having six or more kids. If whites are to survive as a people the *vagina gentium* must, and will, be reopened.

Roger Devlin’s views on marriage made a fairly deep impression in my worldview. (His article a few pages ahead depicts well the horrid monster that egalitarianism has foisted upon Western Civilization.) So deep in fact that nothing aroused more my emotions in the last year than watching both the British television series of *Pride and Prejudice* as well as the 2005 movie adaptation of the same novel, together with the well-known 1995 adaptation of *Sense and Sensibility*: the classics of Jane Austen. In fact, I am taking piano lessons to be able to play the piano soundtrack that Dario Marianelli composed for *Pride and Prejudice*. While imbued in the feeling that today’s West is like a Gomorrah that has to be burned to the ashes, these adaptations stir my soul to such degree that the conclusions in both Austen stories—old-time traditional marriages—move me almost on the verge of tears.

Friedrich Nietzsche’s philosophy has been grossly misrepresented by the Left. It must come as a surprise that the real Nietzsche, not the one who is misquoted in the leftists’ writings, held quite a traditional view of marriage until the very end of his intellectual life.

Nietzsche on marriage

Our institutions are no good any more: on that there is universal agreement. However, it is not their fault but *ours*. Once we have lost all the instincts out of which institutions grow, we lose institutions altogether because *we* are no longer good for them. Democracy has ever been the form of decline in organizing power. In *Human, All-Too-Human* (I, 472) I already characterized modern democracy, together with its hybrids such as the “German Reich,” as the *form of decline of the state*. In order that there may be institutions, there must be a kind of will, instinct, or imperative, which is anti-liberal to the point of malice...

The whole of the West no longer possesses the instincts out of which institutions grow, out of which a *future* grows: perhaps nothing antagonizes its “modern spirit” so much. One lives for the day, one lives very fast, one lives very irresponsibly: precisely this is called “freedom.” That which *makes* an institution an institution is despised, hated, repudiated: one fears the danger of a new slavery the moment the word “authority” is even spoken out loud. That is how far *décadence* has advanced in the value-instincts of our politicians, of our political parties: *instinctively they prefer* what disintegrates, what hastens the end.

Witness modern marriage. All rationality has clearly vanished from modern marriage; yet that is no objection to marriage, but to modernity. The rationality of marriage—that lay in the husband’s sole juridical responsibility, which gave marriage a center of gravity, while today it limps on both legs. The rationality of marriage—that lay in its indissolubility in principle, which lent it an accent that *could be heard* above the accident of feeling, passion, and what is merely momentary. It also lay in the family’s responsibility for the choice of a spouse. With the growing indulgence of *love matches*, the very foundation of marriage has been eliminated, that which alone *makes* an institution of it.

Never, absolutely never, can an institution be founded on an idiosyncrasy; one *cannot*, as I have said, found marriage on “love”—it can be founded on the sex drive, on the property drive (wife and child as property), on the *drive to dominate*, which continually organizes for itself the smallest structure of domination, the family, and which *needs* children and heirs to hold fast—physiologically too—to an attained measure of power, influence, and wealth, in order to prepare for long-range tasks, for a solidarity of instinct between the centuries.

Marriage as an institution involves the affirmation of the largest and most enduring form of organization: when society cannot *affirm* itself as a whole, down to the most distant generations, then marriage has altogether no meaning. Modern marriage *has lost* its meaning—consequently one abolishes it.

From section thirty-nine of “Skirmishes of an
Untimely Man” in *Twilight of the Idols* (1888).

Sexual utopia in power

by F. Roger Devlin

It is well known to readers of this journal that white birthrates worldwide have suffered a catastrophic decline in recent decades. During this same period, ours has become assuredly the most sex-obsessed society in the history of the world. Two such massive, concurrent trends are hardly likely to be unrelated. Many well-meaning conservatives agree in deploring the present situation, but do not agree in describing that situation or how it arose. Correct diagnosis is the first precondition for effective strategy.

The well-worn phrase “sexual revolution” ought, I believe, to be taken with more than customary seriousness. Like the French Revolution, the paradigmatic political revolution of modern times, it was an attempt to realize a utopia, but a sexual rather than political utopia. And like the French Revolution, it has gone through three phases: first, a libertarian or anarchic phase in which the utopia was supposed to occur spontaneously once old ways had been swept aside; second, a reign of terror, in which one faction seized power and attempted to realize its schemes dictatorially; and third, a “reaction” in which human nature gradually reasserted itself. We shall follow this order in the present essay.

Two Utopias

Let us consider what a sexual utopia is, and let us begin with men, who are in every respect simpler.

Nature has played a trick on men: production of spermatozoa occurs at a rate several orders of magnitude greater than female ovulation (about 12 million per hour vs. 400 per lifetime). This is a natural, not a moral, fact. Among the lower animals also, the male is grossly oversupplied with something for which the female has only a limited demand. This means that the female has far greater control over mating. The universal law of nature is that males display and females choose. Male peacocks spread their tails, females choose. Male rams butt horns, females choose. Among humans, boys try to impress girls—and the girls choose. Nature dictates that in the mating dance, the male must wait to be chosen.

A man's sexual utopia is, accordingly, a world in which no such limit to female demand for him exists. It is not necessary to resort to pornography for examples. Consider only popular movies aimed at a male audience, such as the James Bond series. Women simply cannot resist James Bond. He does not have to propose marriage, or even request dates. He simply walks into the room and they swoon. The entertainment industry turns out endless images such as this. Why, the male viewer eventually may ask, cannot life actually be so? To some, it is tempting to put the blame on the institution of marriage.

Marriage, after all, seems to restrict sex rather drastically. Certain men figure that if sex were permitted both inside and outside of marriage there would have to be twice as much sex as formerly. They imagined there existed a large, untapped reservoir of female desire hitherto repressed by monogamy. To release it, they sought, during the early postwar period, to replace the seventh commandment with an endorsement of all sexual activity between "consenting adults." Every man could have a harem. Sexual behavior in general, and not merely family life, was henceforward to be regarded as a private matter. Traditionalists who disagreed were said to want to "put a policeman in every bedroom." This was the age of the Kinsey Reports and the first appearance of *Playboy* magazine. Idle male daydreams had become a social movement.

This characteristically male sexual utopianism of the early postwar years was a forerunner of the sexual revolution but not the revolution itself. Men are incapable of bringing about revolutionary changes in heterosexual relations without the cooperation—the famed "consent"—of women. But the original male would-be revolutionaries did not understand the nature of the female sex instinct. That is why things have not gone according to their plan.

What is the special character of feminine sexual desire that distinguishes it from that of men?

It is sometimes said that men are polygamous and women monogamous. Such a belief is often implicit in the writings of "conservative" male commentators: Women only want good husbands, but heartless men use and abandon them. Some evidence does appear, *prima facie*, to support such a view. One 1994 survey found that "while men projected they would ideally like 6 sex partners over the next year, and 8 over the next two years, women responded that their ideal would be to have only one partner over the next year. And over two years? The answer, for women, was "still one." Is this not evidence that women are naturally monogamous?

No, it is not. Women know their own sexual urges are unruly, but traditionally have had enough sense to keep quiet about it. A husband's belief that his wife is naturally monogamous makes for his own peace of mind. It is not to a wife's advantage, either, that her husband understand her too well: Knowledge is power. In short, we have here a kind of Platonic "noble lie"—a belief which is salutary, although false.

It would be more accurate to say that the female sexual instinct is *hypergamous*. Men may have a tendency to seek sexual variety, but women have simple tastes in the manner of Oscar Wilde: They are always satisfied with the best. By definition, only one man can be the best. These different male and female “sexual orientations” are clearly seen among the lower primates, e.g., in a baboon pack. Females compete to mate at the top, males to get to the top.

Women, in fact, have a distinctive sexual utopia corresponding to their hypergamous instincts. In its purely utopian form, it has two parts: First, she mates with her incubus, the imaginary perfect man; and, second, he “commits,” or ceases mating with all other women. This is the formula of much pulp romance fiction. The fantasy is strictly utopian, partly because no perfect man exists, but partly also because even if he did, it is logically impossible for him to be the exclusive mate of all the women who desire him.

It is possible, however, to enable women to mate hypergamously, i.e., with the most sexually attractive (handsome or socially dominant) men. In the *Ecclesiazusae* of Aristophanes the women of Athens stage a *coup d'état*. They occupy the legislative assembly and barricade their husbands out. Then they proceed to enact a law by which the most attractive males of the city will be compelled to mate with each female in turn, beginning with the least attractive. That is the female sexual utopia in power. Aristophanes had a better understanding of the female mind than the average husband.

Hypergamy is not monogamy in the human sense. Although there may be only one “alpha male” at the top of the pack at any given time, which one it is changes over time. In human terms, this means the female is fickle, infatuated with no more than one man at any given time, but not naturally loyal to a husband over the course of a lifetime. In bygone days, it was permitted to point out natural female inconstancy. Consult, for example, Ring Lardner’s humorous story “I Can’t Breathe”—the private journal of an eighteen-year-old girl who wants to marry a different young man every week. If surveyed on her preferred number of “sex partners,” she would presumably respond “one”; this does not mean she has any idea who it is.

An important aspect of hypergamy is that it implies the rejection of most males. Women are naturally vain. They are inclined to believe that only the “best” (most sexually attractive) man is worthy of them. This is another common theme of popular romance (the beautiful princess, surrounded by panting suitors, pined away hopelessly for a “real” man—until, one day... etc.).

This cannot be objectively true, of course. An average man is *by definition* good enough for an average woman. If each woman were to mate with all men “worthy” of her, she would have no time to do anything else. Once again, hypergamy is distinct from monogamy. It is an irrational instinct; the female sexual utopia is a consequence of that instinct.

The sexual revolution in America was an attempt by women to realize their own utopia, not that of men. Female utopians came forward publicly with plans a few years after Kinsey and *Playboy*. Helen Gurley Brown's *Sex and the Single Girl* appeared in 1962, and she took over *Cosmopolitan* magazine three years later. Notoriously hostile to motherhood, she explicitly encouraged women to use men (including married men) for pleasure.

One Revolution

The actual outbreak of the sexual revolution occurred when significant numbers of young women began acting on the new utopian plan. This seems to have occurred on many college campuses in the 1960s. Women who took birth-control pills and committed fornication with any man who caught their fancy claimed they were liberating themselves from the slavery of marriage. The men, urged by their youthful hormones, frequently went along with this, but were not as happy about it as they are sometimes represented. Columnist Paul Craig Roberts recalls:

I was a young professor when it all started and watched a campus turn into a brothel. The male students were perplexed, even the left-wing ones who had been taught to regard female chastity as oppression. I still remember the resident Marxist who, high on peyote, came to me to complain that "nice girls are ruining themselves."

This should not be surprising. Most men prefer a virgin bride; this is a genuine aspect of male erotic desire favoring monogamy, and hence in constant tension with the impulse to seek sexual variety.

The young women, although hardly philosophers, did set forth arguments to justify their behavior. Most were a variation on the theme that traditional morality involved a "double standard."

It was said that women who had promiscuous sex had been condemned as "sluts" while men who did the same were admired as "studs." It was pointed out that some men sought sex outside marriage and subsequently insisted on their brides being virgins. The common expression "fallen woman," and the absence of a corresponding expression "fallen man," was cited as further evidence of an unfair double standard. The inference the female revolutionaries drew was that woman, too, should henceforward seek sex outside of marriage. This, of course, does not logically follow. They might have determined instead to set wayward men a good example by practicing monogamy regardless of men's own actions.

But let us ignore that for the moment and consider the premise of their argument, the double standard. Like most influential falsehoods, it involves a distortion, rather than a

mere negation, of an important truth. It is plausible, and hence dangerous, because it resembles that truth.

In fact, men have never been encouraged to go about seeking casual sex with multiple women. How could any sane society encourage such behavior? The results are inevitable and obvious: abandoned women and fatherless children who are a financial burden on innocent third parties. Accordingly, promiscuous men have traditionally been regarded as dissolute, dangerous, and dishonorable. They have been called by names such as “libertine” or “rake.” The traditional rule of sexual conduct has been chastity outside of marriage, faithfulness within—for both sexes.

But in one sense there was undoubtedly a double standard: A sexual indiscretion, whether fornication or adultery, has usually been regarded as a more serious matter in a woman than in a man, and socially sanctioned punishments for it have often been greater. In other words, while both sexes were supposed to practice monogamy, it was considered especially important for women to do so. Why is this?

In the first place, they tend to be better at it. This is not due to any moral superiority of the female, as many men are pleased to believe, but to their lower levels of testosterone and their slower sexual cycle: ovulation at the rate of one gamete per month.

Second, if women are all monogamous, the men will perforce be monogamous anyway: It is arithmetically impossible for polygamy to be the norm for men throughout a society because of the human sex ratio at birth.

Third, the private nature of the sexual act and the nine-month human gestation period mean that, while there is not normally doubt as to who the mother of a particular baby is, there may well be doubt regarding the father. Female fidelity is necessary to assure the husband that his wife’s children are also his.

Fourth, women are, next to children, the main beneficiaries of marriage. Most men work their lives away at jobs they do not much care for in order to support wife and family. For women, marriage coincides with economic rationality; for a man, going to a prostitute is a better deal. Accordingly, chastity before marriage and fidelity within it are the very least a woman owes her husband. Indeed, on the traditional view, she owes him a great deal more. She is to make a home for him, return gratitude and loyalty for his support of her, and accept his position as head of the family.

Traditional concern for fallen women does not imply there are no “fallen men.” Fornication is usually a sin of weakness, and undoubtedly many men who fall into it feel ashamed. The real double standard here is that few bother to sympathize with those men. Both men and women are more inclined to pity women. Some of the greatest male novelists of the nineteenth century devoted their best labors to the sympathetic portrayal

of adulteresses. Men, by contrast, are expected to take full responsibility for their actions, no questions asked. In other words, this double standard favors women. So do most traditional sex roles, such as exclusively male liability to military service. The female responsibility to be the primary enforcer of monogamy is something of an exception.

What, after all, is the alternative to the double standard? Is it practical to give sexually desperate young men exclusive responsibility to ensure no act of fornication ever takes place? Or should women be locked up to make it impossible? Logically, a woman must either have no mate, one mate, or more than one mate. The first two choices are socially accepted; the third is not. Such disapproval involves no coercion, however. Women who insist on mating with multiple men *may* do so. But they are responsible for that behavior and its consequences.

Women's complaints about double standards refer only to the few which seem to favor men. They unhesitatingly take advantage of those which favor themselves. Wives in modern, two-income marriages, for example, typically assume that "what I earn is mine; what he earns is ours." Young women insist on their "independence," but assume they are entitled to male protection should things get sticky.

But the ultimate expression of modern female hypocrisy is the assertion of a right to adultery for women only. This view is clearly implied in much contemporary self-help literature aimed at women. Titles like *Get Rid of Him* and *Ditch That Jerk* are found side-by-side *Men Who Can't Love: How to Recognize a Commitmentphobic Man*. In short, I demand loyalty from you, but you have no right to expect it of me. Many women seem sincerely unable to sense a contradiction here. Modern woman wants the benefits of marriage without the responsibilities; she wants a man to marry her without her having to marry the man. It is the eternal dream of irresponsible freedom: In the feminist formulation, freedom for women, responsibility for men.

Men usually accept that their demand for faithfulness from their wives entails a reciprocal duty of faithfulness to their wives. In fact, I am inclined to believe most men lay too much stress on this. For a man, fidelity in marriage should be a matter of preserving his own honor and ensuring that he is able to be a proper father to all his children; his wife's feelings are a secondary matter, as are his own. In any case, the marriage vow is carefully formulated to enunciate a reciprocity of obligations; both the man and woman pledge faithfulness for life. Given innate sex differences, it is not possible to eliminate the double standard any more than marriage already has.

Fallout of the Revolution: "Date Rape"

A few years into the sexual revolution, shocking reports began to appear of vast numbers of young women—from one quarter to half—being victims of rape. Shock turned to

bewilderment when the victims were brought forward to tell their stories. The “rapists,” it turns out, were never lying in wait for them in remote corners, were not armed, did not attack them. Instead, these “date rapes” occur in private places, usually college dormitory rooms, and involve no threats or violence. In fact, they little resemble what most of us think of as rape.

What was going on here?

Take a girl too young to understand what erotic desire is and subject her to several years of propaganda to the effect that she has a right to have things any way she wants them in this domain—with no corresponding duties to God, her parents, or anyone else. Do not give her any guidance as to what it might be good for her to want, how she might try to regulate her own conduct, or what qualities she ought to look for in a young man. Teach her furthermore that the notion of natural differences between the sexes is a laughable superstition that our enlightened age is gradually overcoming—with the implication that men’s sexual desires are no different from or more intense than her own. Meanwhile, as she matures physically, keep her protected in her parents’ house, sheltered from responsibility.

Then, at age seventeen or eighteen, take her suddenly away from her family and all the people she has ever known. She can stay up as late as she wants! She can decide for herself when and how much to study! She’s making new friends all the time, young women and men both. It’s no big deal having them over or going to their rooms; everybody is perfectly casual about it. What difference does it make if it’s a boy she met at a party? He seems like a nice fellow, like others she meets in class.

Now let us consider the young man she is alone with. He is neither a saint nor a criminal, but, like all normal young men of college years, he is intensely interested in sex. There are times he cannot study without getting distracted by the thought of some young woman’s body. He has had little real experience with girls, and most of that unhappy. He has been rejected a few times with little ceremony, and it was more humiliating than he cares to admit. He has the impression that for other young men things are not as difficult: “Everybody knows,” after all, that since the 1960s men get all the sex they like, right? He is bombarded with talk about sex on television, in the words to popular songs, in rumors about friends who supposedly “scored” with this or that girl. He begins to wonder if there isn’t something wrong with him.

Furthermore, he has received the same education about sex as the girl he is now with. He has learned that people have the right to do anything they want. The only exception is rape. But that is hardly even relevant to him; he is obviously incapable of doing something like that.

He has also been taught that there are no important differences between the sexes. This means, of course, that girls want sex just as badly as he does, though they slyly pretend otherwise. And are not their real desires verified by all those *Cosmopolitan* magazine covers he sees constantly at the grocery store? If women are so eager to read such stuff, why should it be so damned difficult to find just one girl willing to go to bed with him?

But tonight, finally, something seemed to click. He met a girl at a party. They chatted, perhaps drank a bit: all smiles, quite unlike the girls who had been so quick about rejecting him in high school. She even let him come to her room afterwards (or came to his). It doesn't take a genius to figure out what she is thinking, he says to himself. This is a tremendously important moment for him; every ounce of his self-respect is at stake. He is confused and his heart is pounding, but he tries to act as if he knows what he is doing. She seems confused, too, and he meets no more than token resistance (or so it seems to him). He doesn't actually enjoy it, and isn't sure whether she does either. But that is beside the point; it only matters that he can finally consider himself a man. Later on they can talk about what terms they want to be on, whether she will be his regular girlfriend, etc. Matrimony is not exactly uppermost in his mind, but he might not rule it out—eventually. He asks her how she feels afterwards, and she mumbles that she is “okay.” This sets his mind at rest. An awkward parting follows.

Later that night or the next morning our young woman is trying to figure out what in hell has happened to her. Why had he gotten so pushy all of a sudden? Didn't he even want to get to know her first? It was confusing, it all happened so quickly. Sex, she had always heard, was supposed to be something wonderful; but this she had not enjoyed at all. She felt somehow used.

Of course, at no point does it enter her mind to question her own right to have been intimate with the young man if she had wanted to. Moral rule number one, we all know, is that all sex between consenting adults is licit. She just isn't sure whether she had really wanted this. In fact, the more she thinks about it, the more certain she feels that she hadn't. But if she hadn't wanted it, then it was against her will, wasn't it? And if it was against her will, that means... she's been raped?

I sympathize with the young woman, in view of a miseducation which might have been consciously designed to leave her unprepared for the situation she got herself into. But as to the question of whether she was raped, the answer must be a clear *no*.

Let me explain by means of an analogy with something less emotionally laden. Consider someone who purchases a lottery ticket which does not win the prize. Suppose he were to argue as follows: “I put my money down because I wanted the prize. I wouldn't have paid if I had known I was going to lose; therefore I have been deprived of my money against my will; therefore I am the victim of theft.” No one would accept this argument as valid. Why shouldn't we?

For the very good reason that it denies the fundamental principle behind all personal responsibility. Those who want to make their own choices in life must be willing to accept the consequences of those choices. Consider the alternative: If every loser in a lottery were entitled to a refund there would be no money left for the prize, and so no lottery. For similar reasons, most civilized institutions depend upon people taking responsibility for their actions, keeping agreements, and fulfilling obligations regardless of whether or not they happen to like the consequences.

The grandmother of the young woman in our story was unaware that she possessed a “right” to sleep with any boy who took her fancy—or to invite him to her bedroom and expect nothing to happen. It was the male and female sexual utopians of the postwar period who said women should be allowed unlimited freedom to choose for themselves in such matters. Unfortunately, they did not lay much stress on the need to accept the consequences of poor choices. Instead, they treated the moral and social norms women in particular had traditionally used to guide themselves as wholly irrational barriers to pleasure. Under their influence, two generations of women have been led to believe that doing as they please should lead to happiness and involve no risk. Hence the moral sophistry of “I didn’t like it; *ergo* I didn’t want it; *ergo* it was against my will.”

To anyone who believes that a society of free and responsible persons is preferable to one based on centralized control, the reasoning of the date rape movement is ominous. The demand that law rather than moral principle and common prudence should protect women in situations such as I have described could only be met by literally “putting a policeman in every bedroom.” However much we may sympathize with the misled young people involved (and I mean the men as well as the women), we must insist that it is no part of our responsibility to create an absolutely safe environment for them, nor to shield them from the consequences of their own behavior, nor to insure that sex shall be their path to happiness. Because there are some things of greater importance than the pain they have suffered, and among these are the principle of responsibility upon which the freedom of all of us depends.

It was never the traditional view that a woman’s erotic power over men was anything she possessed unconditional personal rights over. Instead, the use to which she put this natural power was understood to be freighted with extensive responsibilities—to God, her family, the man to whom she gave herself, the children produced by the union, and her own *long-term* well being. In order to fulfill her obligations as creature, daughter, wife, and mother she required considerable powers of self-control. This cultivated and socially reinforced sexual self-control was known as modesty. It required chiefly the duty of chastity before marriage and fidelity within marriage; secondarily, it involved maintaining a certain demeanor toward men—polite but reserved.

Now, every duty does imply a right: If we have a duty to provide for our children or defend our country we necessarily possess the right to do so as well. Formerly, insofar as sexual rights were recognized, they were understood to have this character of resting upon duties. Thus, a woman did indeed have the right to refuse the sexual advances of any man not her husband. But this was only because she was not understood to have any moral right to *accept* a proposal of fornication or adultery (even in the absence of legal sanctions therefore).

The reason rape was regarded as a particularly odious form of assault is that it violated this superpersonal moral principle by which a woman subordinated her momentary private desires to the well-being of those closest to her. Modesty had to be respected, or else protected, if it was to perform its essential social function of guarding the integrity of families.

Under Roman law it was not considered a serious crime to rape a prostitute: A man could not violate the modesty of a woman who had none to violate. In later European law it was made criminal to rape even prostitutes. But this does not mean that the concept of rape had been divorced from that of feminine modesty; it was rather that the law now recognized and protected the possibility of repentance for immodesty. (Christianity is relevant here.)

The sexual revolution asserted the right of each individual to sex on his or her own terms—in other words, a right of perfect selfishness in erotic matters. One effect of this change was to eliminate the moral dignity of feminine modesty. It was not to be forbidden, of course, but was henceforward to be understood as no more than a personal taste, like anchovies or homosexuality. When the initial excitement of abandoned restraint had died down it was noticed that the promised felicity had not arrived. And one reason, it was soon realized, was that the terms men wished to set for sexual conduct were not identical to those desired by women. This being so, the granting to men of a right to sex on their own terms necessarily involved the denial of such a right to women. The anarchy with which the sexual revolution began was necessarily a passing phase.

From Sexual Anarchy to Sexual Terror

It is a cliché of political philosophy that the less self-restraint citizens are able to exercise, the more they must be constrained from without. The practical necessity of such a trade-off can be seen in such extraordinary upheavals as the French and Russian revolutions. First, old and habitual patterns and norms are thrown aside in the name of freedom. When the ensuing chaos becomes intolerable, some group with the requisite ambition, self-assurance, and ruthlessness succeeds in forcibly imposing its own order on the weakened society. This is what gradually happened in the case of the sexual revolution also, with the role of Jacobins/Bolsheviks being assumed by the feminists.

Human beings cannot do without some social norms to guide them in their personal relations. Young women cannot be expected to work out a personal system of sexual ethics in the manner of Descartes reconstructing the universe in his own mind. If you cease to prepare them for marriage, they will seek guidance wherever they can find it. In the past thirty years they have found it in feminism, simply because the feminists have outshouted everyone else.

After helping to encourage sexual experimentation by young women, feminism found itself able to capitalize on the unhappiness which resulted. Their program for rewriting the rules of human sexual behavior is in one way a continuation of the liberationists' utopian program and in another way a reaction against it. The feminists approve the notion of a right to do as one pleases without responsibilities toward others; they merely insist that only women have this right.

Looking about them for some legal and moral basis for enforcing this novel claim, they hit upon the age-old prohibition against rape. Feminists understand rape, however, not as a violation of a woman's chastity or marital fidelity, but of her merely personal wishes. They are making use of the ancient law against rape to enforce not respect for feminine modesty but obedience to female whims. Their ideal is not the man whose self-control permits a woman to exercise her own, but the man who is subservient to a woman's good pleasure—the man who behaves, not like a gentleman, but like a dildo.

But mere disregard of a woman's personal wishes is manifestly not the reason men have been disgraced, imprisoned, in some societies even put to death for the crime of rape. On the new view, in which consent rather than the marriage bond is the issue, the same sexual act may be a crime on Monday or Wednesday and a right on Tuesday or Thursday, according to the shifts in a woman's mood. Feminists claim rape is not taken seriously enough; perhaps it would be better to ask how it could be taken seriously at all once we begin defining it as they do. If women want to be free to do as they please with men, after all, why should not men be free to do as they please with women?

Indeed, the date rape campaign owes its success only to the lingering effect of older views. Feminists themselves are not confused about this; they write openly of "redefining rape." Of course, for those of us who still speak traditional English, this amounts to an admission that they are falsely accusing men.

One might have more sympathy for the "date rape victims" if they wanted the men to marry them, feared they were "ruined" for other suitors, and were prepared to assume their own obligations as wives and mothers. But this is simply not the case. The date rape campaigners, if not the confused young women themselves, are hostile to the very idea of matrimony, and never propose it as a solution. They want to jail men, not make

responsible husbands of them. This is far worse than shotgun marriage, which at least allowed the man to act as father to the child he had engendered.

And what benefit do women derive from imprisoning men as date rapists apart from gratification of a desire for revenge? Seeing men punished may even confirm morally confused women in their mistaken sense of victimhood—resentment tends to feed upon itself, like an itch that worsens with scratching. Women are reinforced in the belief that it is their right for men's behavior to be anything they would like it to be. They become less inclined to treat men with respect or to try to learn to understand or compromise with them. In a word, they learn to think and behave like spoiled children, expecting everything and willing to give nothing.

Men, meanwhile, respond to this in ways that are not difficult to predict. They may not (at first) decline sexual liaisons with such women, because the woman's moral shortcomings do not have too great an effect upon the sexual act itself. But, quite rationally, they will avoid any deeper involvement with them. So women experience fewer, shorter, and worse marriages and "relationships" with men. But they do not blame themselves for the predicament they are in; they refuse to see any connection between their own behavior and their loneliness and frustration. Thus we get ever more frequent characterizations of men as rapists and predators who mysteriously refuse to commit.

Indeed, the only people profiting from the imposition of the new standards are the feminists who invented them. The survival of their movement depends on a continuing supply of resentful women who believe their rights are being violated; one can only admit that the principles which undergird the date rape campaign are admirably designed to guarantee such a supply. Feminism is a movement that thrives on its own failures; hence, it is very difficult to reverse.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, eleventh edition, lists the first recorded use of the term "date rape" as 1975. Within a few years we find so thoroughgoing a traditionalist as Thomas Fleming of *Chronicles* using the expression as matter-of-factly as any feminist zealot. A second instrument of the feminist reign of sexual terror, "sexual harassment," similarly made its first appearance in 1975. In less than a generation this has become a national industry providing a comfortable living for many people. Yet again we find this revolutionary concept blithely accepted by many conservatives. They are content to accept without argument that there exists a widespread problem of men "harassing" women, and that "something must be done about it." My first thought would be: What did the Romans do about it? What did the Christian Church do about it? How about the Chinese or the Aztecs? The obvious answer is that none of them did anything about it, because the concept has only recently developed within the context of the feminist movement. Is this not cause for suspicion? Why are men so quick to adopt the language of their declared enemies?

The thinking behind the sexual harassment movement is that women are entitled to “an environment free from unwanted sexual advances”—meaning, in plain English, romantic overtures from unattractive men. Anyone who has been forced to endure a corporate antiharassment video can see that what is being condemned is merely traditional male courtship behavior.

The introduction of harassment law was accompanied by a campaign to inform young women of the new entitlement. Colleges, for example, instituted harassment committees one of whose stated purposes was “to encourage victims to come forward.” (I saw this happening up close.) The agitators *wanted* as many young women as possible accusing unsuccessful suitors of wrongdoing. And they had considerable success; many women unhesitatingly availed themselves of the new dispensation. Young men found they risked visits from the police for flirting or inviting women on dates.

This female bullying should be contrasted with traditional male chivalry. Men, at least within Western civilization, have been socialized into extreme reluctance to use force against women. This is not an absolute principle: Few would deny that a man has a right of self-defense against a woman attempting to kill him. But many men will refuse to retaliate against a woman under almost any lesser threat. This attitude is far removed from the feminist principle of equality between the sexes. Indeed, it seems to imply a view of men as naturally dominant: It is a form of *noblesse oblige*. And it is not, so far as I can see, reducible to any long-term self-interest on the part of a man; in other words, it is a principle of honor. The code of chivalry holds that a man has no moral right to use force against women simply because he *can* do so.

An obvious difficulty with such a code is that it is vulnerable to abuse by its beneficiaries. I had a classmate in grade school who had heard it said somewhere that “boys are not supposed to hit girls.” Unfortunately, she interpreted this to mean that it was acceptable for girls to hit boys, which she then proceeded to do. She became genuinely indignant when she found that they usually hit back.

The special character of *noblesse oblige* is that it does not involve a corresponding entitlement on the part of the beneficiary. On the traditional view, a man should indeed be reluctant to use force against women, but women have no right to presume upon this. The reluctance is elicited by a recognition of women’s weakness, not commanded as a recognition of their rights.

Perhaps because women *are* the weaker sex, they have never developed any similar inhibitions about using force against men. In a traditionally ordered society, this does not present difficulties, because a woman’s obligations to her husband are clearly understood and socially enforced. But the situation changes when millions of spoiled, impressionable young women have been convinced men are “harassing” them and that the proper

response is to appeal to force of law and the police powers of the state. Indeed, the system is now set up to reward them for doing so.

Men, on the other hand, are frequently denied due process, ruined professionally, and threatened with particularly harsh punishments for any retaliation against the women accusing them of a newly invented and ill-defined crime. For prudential reasons, some men will outwardly conform to the new rules. But it is unlikely that the traditional reluctance *in foro interno* to use force against women can long survive the present pattern of female behavior. If I were a woman, I would be worried about this.

Return of the Primitive

Public discussion of the sexual revolution has tended to focus on date rape and “hook-ups,” that is, on what *is* taking place, rather than on the formation of stable families that is *not* taking place. Survey results are occasionally announced apparently indicating male satisfaction with their “sex lives” and female unhappiness with theirs. This creates an impression that there really is “more sex” for men today than before some misguided girls misbehaved themselves forty years ago. People speak as if the male sexual utopia of a harem for every man has actually been realized.

It is child’s play to show, not merely that this is untrue, but that it *cannot* be true. There is roughly the same number of male as female children (not quite: there are about 5 percent more live male births than female—there is not a girl for every boy). What happens when female sexual desire is liberated is not an increase in the total amount of sex available to men, but a redistribution of the existing supply. Society becomes polygamous. A situation emerges in which most men are desperate for wives, but most women are just as desperately throwing themselves at a very few exceptionally attractive men. These men, who had always found it easy to get a mate, henceforward get multiple mates.

A characteristic feature of decadent societies is the recrudescence of primitive, precivilized cultural forms. That is what is happening to us. Sexual liberation really means the Darwinian mating pattern of the baboon pack reappears among humans.

Once monogamy is abolished, no restriction is placed on a woman’s choices. Hence, all women choose the same few men. If Casanova had 132 lovers it is because 132 different women chose him. Such men acquire harems, not because they are predators, but because they happen to be attractive. The problem is not so much male immorality as simple arithmetic; it is obviously impossible for every woman to have *exclusive* possession of the most attractive man. If women want to mate simply as their natural drives impel them, they must, rationally speaking, be willing to share their mate with others.

But, of course, women's attitude about this situation is not especially rational. They expect their alpha man to "commit." Woman's complaining about men's failure to commit, one suspects, means merely that they are unable to get a highly attractive man to commit *to them*, rather as if an ordinary man were to propose to Helen of Troy and complain of her refusal by saying "women don't want to get married."

Furthermore, many women are sexually attracted to promiscuous men because, not in spite, of their promiscuity. This can be explained with reference to the primate pack. The "alpha male" can be identified by his mating with many females. This is probably where the sluts-and-studs double standard argument came from—not from any social approval of male promiscuity, but from female fascination with it. Male "immorality" (in traditional language) is attractive to females. Thus, once polygamous mating begins, it tends to be self-reinforcing.

Students of animal behavior have learned that the presence of a female decoy or two near a male makes real females more likely to mate with that particular male. Among human females also, nothing succeeds like success. I hear anecdotes about women refusing to date thirtyish bachelors because, "if he's never been married, there must be something wrong with him." In college I observed decent, clean-living men left alone while notorious adulterers had no difficulty going from one girlfriend to the next.

Commentators on contemporary mores rarely show awareness of this irrationality in female mate selection. I recall seeing an article some years ago in which a planned new college was touted as a boon to young women seeking "Christian husbands," on the naive assumption that they must be doing so. There was no talk of helping young men find faithful wives, of course.

Modern Chivalry

Both men and women find it easier to sympathize with young women than with young men. In the case of male observers a kind of rescue fantasy is probably at work. The literature and folklore of the world is replete with stories of heroes rescuing innocent maidens from the clutches of villains: too much for it to be an accident. The damsel in distress scenario appeals to something deeply rooted in men's minds, and probably natural. Most likely it is merely a self-congratulatory interpretation of mate competition. Men project their unruly sexual instincts onto others, who are thus cast into the role of predators.

In the contemporary world, the male protective instinct often perversely expresses itself in support for feminist causes: for example, chiming in with the denunciation of harassers and date rapists. This is a form of gallantry singularly well-adapted to the sedentary habits of the modern male, involving neither risk nor sacrifice. Examples abound in the

conservative press. College men are regularly spoken of as “preying” upon women—who are in fact quite old enough to be married and starting a family. Joseph Farah of *World Net Daily* commends a wife for murdering her unfaithful husband. There are calls for bringing back shotgun marriage and the death penalty for rapists. If only sufficiently draconian punishments can be meted out to villainous males, the reasoning seems to go, everything will be all right again. The fundamental error in such thinking is its failure to recognize that the female largely controls the mating process.

Shrewd women have long known how to manipulate the male protective urge for their own ends. The feminist attack on heterosexuality and the family is directed against husbands and fathers for reasons of public relations. No one will sign up for a campaign against women or children, but many men can easily be made to condemn other men. The result is that young men today are in an impossible situation. If they seek a mate they are predators; if they find one they are date rapists; if they want to avoid the whole ordeal they are immature and irresponsible for not committing. We have gone from a situation where it seemed everything was permitted to one where nothing is permitted. Marriage as a binding legal contract has been done away with, and young men are still supposed to believe it is wrong for them to seek sex outside of marriage. It is not prudent to put this much strain on human nature.

Meanwhile, the illusion of there being “too much sex” has led to proposals for “abstinence education,” provided by government schools and paid for with tax money. The geniuses of establishment conservatism may need a gentle reminder that the human race is not perpetuated through sexual abstinence. They might do better to ponder how many families have not formed and how many children have not been born due to overzealous attempts to protect young women from men who might have made good husbands and fathers.

The Revolution Destroys Sex

So far we have focused on female promiscuity, and undoubtedly it is a serious problem. But there are two ways for women not to be monogamous: by having more than one mate and—by having less than one. Let us now consider the spinsters as well as the sluts. Here again I would warn against a misconception common among male writers: The assumption that young women *not* having sexual relations with men must be modest. In fact, there are numerous reasons besides religious or moral principle which can keep a woman from taking a mate, and some of these now operate more strongly than before the sexual revolution. Consider the following passage from *A Return to Modesty* by Wendy Shalit:

“Pfffffft!” sexual modesty says to the world, “I think *I’m* worth waiting for... So not you, not you, not you, and not *you* either.”

This is certainly not modest. As one 27-year-old Orthodox woman put it to me... “the daughters of Israel are not available for public use.” She was taking obvious, almost haughty, satisfaction in the fact that she wasn’t sleeping around with *just* anyone.

This is pure illusion, a consequence of natural female hypergamy and not dependent on any actual merit in the woman. But it may be a socially useful illusion. If a woman believes she is “too good” to sleep around, this may help keep her faithful to her husband. Marriage, in other words, is a way of channeling female hypergamy in a socially useful way. (We frequently hear of the need to channel the male sexual instinct into marriage and family, but not the female; this is a mistake.)

In any case, women are not so much naturally modest as naturally vain. Hypergamy implies rejection maximization; if only the best is good enough, almost everyone *isn't* good enough. Rather than cheapening herself, as observers tend to assume, modern woman may be pricing herself out of the market. It used to be commonly said that “a woman who thinks she is too good for any man may be right, but more often—she is left.” Why might this be an especial danger for women today?

Formerly, most people lived parochial lives in a world where even photography did not exist. Their notions of sexual attractiveness were limited by their experience. Back in my own family tree, for example, there was a family with three daughters who grew up on a farm adjoining three others. As each girl came of age, she married a boy from one of the neighboring farms. They did not expect that much in a husband. It is probable all three went through life without ever seeing a man who looked like Cary Grant.

But by the 1930s millions of women were watching Cary Grant two hours a week and silently comparing their husbands with him. For several decades since then the entertainment industry has continued to grow and coarsen. Finally the point has been reached that many women are simply not interested in meeting any man who does not look like a movie star. While it is not possible to make all men look like movie stars, it is possible to encourage women to throw themselves at *or hold out for* the few who do, i.e., to become sluts or spinsters, respectively. Helen Gurley Brown raked in millions doing precisely this. The brevity of a woman’s youthful bloom, combined with a mind not yet fully formed at that stage of life, always renders her vulnerable to unrealistic expectations. The sexual revolution is in part a large-scale commercial exploitation of this vulnerability.

Yes, men are also, to their own detriment, continually surrounded with images of exceptionally attractive women. But this has less practical import, because—to say it once more—*women choose*. Even plain young women are often able to obtain sexual favors from good-looking or socially dominant men; they have the option to be promiscuous. Many women do not understand that ordinary young men do not have that option.

Traditionalists sometimes speak as if monogamy were a cartel whose purpose was to restrict the amount of sex available to men artificially so as to drive up the price for the benefit of women. (That is roughly what the male sexual utopians believed also.) But this would require that men be able to raise their bid, i.e., make themselves more attractive at will. Monogamy does not get women as a group more desirable mates than would otherwise be available to them. A different economic analogy is apposite here: In sex as in other matters the buyers, not the sellers, ultimately determine the price. And the buyers, by and large, are merely average men.

Furthermore, many young women appear to believe that any man who attempts to meet them *ipso facto* wishes to take them as a mate. Partly this is youthful naïveté; partly a result of the disintegration of socially agreed upon courtship procedures; and partly due to the feminist campaign to label male courtship behavior “harassment.” So they angrily reject every advance they receive during their nubile years as if these were merely crude sexual propositioning. As they enter their late twenties, it gradually dawns on them that it might be prudent to accept at least a few date requests. They are then astonished to discover that the men usually take them out once or twice and then stop calling. They claim the men are leading them on. They believe themselves entitled to a wedding ring in return for the great condescension of finally accepting a date. Just as some men think the world owes them a living, these women think the world owes them a husband.

When a man asks a woman out he is only implying that he is willing to *consider* her as a mate: He might conceivably offer her a ring if she pleases him enough on further acquaintance. Most dates do not result in marriage proposals. There is no reason why they should. Rather than blame men for not committing in such instances, they should be commended for sexual self-control and the exercise of caution in mate-seeking.

To summarize: the encouragement of rejection maximization and unrealistic expectations is one reason (unrelated to modesty) that many women today do not reproduce. A second is what I call parasitic dating, a kind of economic predation upon the male by the female. Let me explain.

The decline of matrimony is often attributed to men now being able to “get what they want” from women without marrying them. But what if a woman is able to get everything *she* wants from a man without marriage? Might she not also be less inclined to “commit” under such circumstances? In truth, a significant number of women seek primarily attention and material goods from men. They are happy to date men they have no romantic interest in merely as a form of entertainment and a source of free meals and gifts. A man can waste a great deal of money and time on such a woman before he realizes he is being used.

Family life involves sacrifice; a good mother *devotes herself* to her children. Parasitic daters are takers, not givers; they are not fit for marriage or motherhood. Their character is

usually fixed by the time a man meets them. Since he cannot change them, the only rational course is to learn to identify and avoid them.

A third obstacle to female reproduction is date rape hysteria. The reader may consult the first couple of chapters of Katie Roiphe's *The Morning After*. At an age when women have traditionally actively sought mates, they now participate in "take back the night" marches, "rape awareness" campaign, and self-defense classes involving kicking male dummies in the groin. These young women seem less afraid of anything men are actually doing than they are of male sexual desire itself. In the trenchant words of columnist Angela Fiori "the campus date rape campaigns of the early 1990s weren't motivated by a genuine concern for the well-being of women. They were part of an ongoing attempt to delegitimize heterosexuality to young, impressionable women by demonizing men as rapists." Self-defense training, for example, really serves to inculcate a defensive *mentality* toward men, making trust and intimacy impossible.

Part of the transition to womanhood has always been learning to relate to men. Attempts to pander to girls' irrational fears are now keeping many of them in a state of arrested development. There is little that individual men can do about this, nor is there any reason they should be expected to. Who would want to court a girl encased in an impenetrable psychic armor of suspicion?

Once again, well-meaning male traditionalists have not been free of fault in their reactions to this situation. Fathers encourage self-defense classes and date rape paranoia on the assumption that their daughters' safety overrides all other concerns. Eventually they may start wondering why they have no grandchildren.

Fourth, many women are without a mate for the simple reason that they have abandoned their men. Women formally initiate divorce about two thirds of the time. Most observers agree, however, that this understates matters: In many cases where the husband formally initiates, it is because his wife wants out of the marriage. Exact data are elusive, but close observers tend to estimate that women are responsible for about nine-tenths of the divorcing and breaking-up: Men do not love them and leave them, but love them and get *left by* them. Many young women, indeed, believe they want marriage when all they really want is a wedding (think of bridal magazines). The common pattern is that women are the first to want into marriage and the first to want out. Of course, it is easy to *get* married; the difficulty is living happily ever after.

Typically, the faithless wife does not intend to remain alone. But some men have scruples about involving themselves with divorcées; they wonder "Whose wife is this I'm dating?" There are also merely prudential considerations; a woman with a track record of abandoning her husband is hardly likely to be more faithful the second time around. And few men are eager to support another man's children financially. Women frequently

express indignation at their inability to find a replacement for the husband they walked out on: I call these women the angry adulteresses.

Vanity, parasitism, paranoia, and infidelity are only a few of the unpleasant characteristics of contemporary Western womanhood; one more is rudeness. To an extent this is part of the general decline in civility over the past half century, in which both sexes have participated. But I believe some of it is a consequence of female sexual utopianism. Here is why.

One would get the idea looking at *Cosmopolitan* magazine covers that women were obsessed with giving men sexual pleasure. This would come as news to many men. Indeed, the contrast between what women read and their actual behavior towards men has become almost surreal. The key to the mystery is that the man the *Cosmo*-girl is interested in pleasing is imaginary. She is going to meet him after one more new makeover, after losing five more pounds or finding the perfect hairdo. In the meantime, she is free to treat the flesh-and-blood men she runs into like dirt. Why make the effort of being civil to ordinary men as long as you are certain a perfect one is going to come along tomorrow? Men of the older generation are insufficiently aware how uncouth women have become. I came rather late to the realization that the behavior I was observing in women could not possibly be normal—that if women had behaved this way in times past, the human race would have died out.

The reader who suspects me of exaggerating is urged to spend a little time browsing women's self-descriptions on Internet dating sites. They *never* mention children, but almost always manage to include the word "fun." "I like to party and have fun! I like to drink, hang out with cool people, and go shopping!" The young women invite "hot guys" to contact them. No doubt some will, and perhaps have a bit of fun with them. But would any sensible man, "hot" or otherwise, start a family with such a creature?

A good wife does not simply happen. Girls were once brought up from childhood with the idea that they were going to be wives and mothers. They were taught the skills necessary to that end. A young suitor could expect a girl to know a few things about cooking and homemaking. Today, many women seem unaware that they are supposed to have something to offer a husband besides a warm body.

What happens when a contemporary woman, deluded into thinking she deserves a movie star husband, fails not only to find her ideal mate, but any mate at all? She does not blame herself for being unreasonable or gullible, of course; she blames men. A whole literary genre has emerged to pander to female anger with the opposite sex. Here are a few titles, all currently available through Amazon.com: *Why Men Are Clueless*, *"Let's Face it, Men are @\$#%\e\$": What Women Can Do About It, How to Aggravate A Man Every Time... And Have Him Beg for Mercy*, *Things You Can Do With a Useless Man*, *101 Reasons Why a Cat Is Better Than a Man*, *101 Lies Men Tell Women—And Why Women Believe Them*, *Men Who Hate Women*

and the Women Who Love Them, Kiss-Off Letters to Men: Over 70 Zingers You Can Use to Send Him Packing, Mess with His Head, or Just Plain Dump Him, or—for the woman who gets sent packing herself—How to Heal the Hurt by Hating.

For some women, hatred of men has now taken on psychotic dimensions. A large billboard in my hometown asks passing motorists: “How many women have to die before domestic violence is considered a crime?” One is forced to wonder what is going on in the minds of those who sponsor such a message. Are they really unaware that it has always been a crime for a man to murder his wife? Are they just trying to stir up fear? Or are their own minds so clouded by hatred that they can no longer view the world realistically?

This is where we have arrived after just one generation of female sexual liberation. Many men are bewildered when they realize the extent and depth of feminine rage at them. What could be making the most affluent and pampered women in history so furious?

Internet scribe Henry Makow has put forward the most plausible diagnosis I have yet seen, in an essay entitled “The Effect of Sexual Deprivation on Women.” Apropos of the recent rape hysteria, he suggests: “Men are ‘rapists’ because they are not giving women the love they need.” In other words, what if the problem is that men, ahem, *aren’t* preying upon women? All that we have just said supports the theory that Western civilization is now facing an epidemic of female sexual frustration. And once again, the typical conservative commentator is wholly unable to confront the problem correctly: He instinctively wants to step forward in shining armor and exclaim “Never fear, tender maids, I shall prevent these vicious beasts from sullying your virgin purity.” If women need love from men and aren’t getting it, this is not going to help them.

The Forgotten Men

The attempt to realize a sexual utopia for women was doomed to failure before it began. Women’s wishes aim at the impossible, conflict with one another, and change unpredictably. Hence, any program to force men (or “society”) to fulfill women’s wishes must fail, even if all men were willing to submit to it. Pile entitlement upon entitlement for women, heap punishment after punishment onto men: It cannot work, because women’s wishes will always outpace legislation and lead to new demands.

But while the revolution has not achieved its aims, it has certainly achieved *something*. It has destroyed monogamy and family stability. It has resulted in a polygamous mating pattern of immodest women aggressively pursuing a small number of men. It has decreased the number of children born, and insured that many who are born grow up without a father in their lives. And, least often mentioned, it has made it impossible for many decent men to find wives.

One occasionally hears of studies purporting to show that men are happier with their “sex lives” than women. It has always struck me as ludicrous that anyone would take such survey results at face value. First, women complain more about *everything* than men. But second, many men (especially young men) experience a powerful *mauvaise honte* when they are unsuccessful with women. They rarely compare notes with other men, and still more rarely do so honestly. Everyone puts up a brave front, however lonely he may actually be. Hence, men almost always imagine other men to have greater success with women than is actually the case. This situation has worsened since the 1960s, with the propagation of the illusion that there is “more sex” available to men than formerly.

But if women are only mating with a few exceptionally attractive men, and if many women fail to mate at all, there *must* be a large number of men unable to get a woman. We might, in the spirit of William Gilmore Simms, term them the forgotten men of the sexual revolution. I have reason to believe that a growing number are willing to come out of the closet (to use a currently popular expression) and admit that, whoever has been doing all the “hooking up” one reads about, it hasn’t been them. Simple prudence dictates that we give some consideration to the situation of these men. In societies where polygamy is openly practiced (e.g., in Africa and the Muslim world), young bachelors tend to form gangs which engage in antisocial behavior: “It is not good for man to be alone.”

In our society, a definite pattern has already emerged of “singles” groups or events being composed of innocent, never-married men in their thirties and cynical, bitter, often divorced women. What have the bachelors been doing with themselves all these years? So far, in the West, they have not been forming criminal gangs. They would probably be more attractive to women if they did: Everyone seems to have heard the stories about men on death row being besieged with offers of marriage from bored, thrill-seeking females.

I suggest that today’s bachelors are hardly different from men who, before the sexual revolution, married young and raised families.

Natural instinct makes young men almost literally “crazy” about girls. They believe young women are something wonderful when in fact most are not. The male sex drive that modern women complain so much about exists largely for women’s benefit. As Schopenhauer wrote:

Nature has provided [the girl] with superabundant beauty and charm for a few years... so that during these years she may so capture the imagination of a man that he is carried away into undertaking to support her honorably in some form or another for the rest of her life, a step he would seem hardly likely to take for purely rational considerations. Thus nature has equipped women, as it has all its creatures, with the tools and weapons she needs for securing her existence.

So far from being unwilling to commit, many men are only too happy to marry the first girl they meet who is nice to them. The modern bachelor is no different.

Furthermore, many men assume women value honest, clean-living, responsible men (as opposed to death-row criminals). So slowly, patiently, by dint of much hard work, amid uncertainty and self-doubt, our bachelor makes a decent life for himself. No woman is there to give him love, moral support, loyalty. If he did make any effort to get a wife, he may have found himself accused of “harassment” or “stalking.”

What were our bachelor’s female contemporaries doing all those years while he was an impoverished, lonely stripling who found them intensely desirable? Fornicating with dashing fellows who mysteriously declined to “commit,” marrying and walking out on their husbands, or holding out for perfection. Now, lo and behold, these women, with their youthful looks gone and rapidly approaching menopause, are willing to go out with him. If they are satisfied with the free meals and entertainment he provides, he may be permitted to fork over a wedding ring. Then they will graciously allow him to support them and the children they had by another man for the rest of his life. (I have seen a woman’s personal ad stating her goal of “achieving financial security for myself and my daughters.”) Why in heaven’s name would any man sign up for this? As one man put it to me: “If the kitten didn’t want me, I don’t want the cat.”

Western woman has become the new “white man’s burden,” and the signs are that he is beginning to throw it off.

Sexual Thermidor: The Marriage Strike

The term “Thermidor” originally designated the month of the French Revolutionary calendar in which the terror ended. By July 1794, twenty or thirty persons were being guillotined daily in Paris under a so-called Law of Suspects requiring no serious evidence against the accused. Addressing the Convention on July 26, Robespierre incautiously let slip that certain delegates were themselves under suspicion of being “traitors,” but declined to name them. His hearers realized their only hope of safety lay in destroying Robespierre before he could destroy them. They concerted their plans that night, and the following morning he was arrested. Within two days, he and eighty of his followers went to the guillotine. Over the next few weeks, the prisons emptied and life again assumed a semblance of normality.

Something analogous appears to be happening today in the case of feminism. Consider, for example, the sexual harassment movement. As it spreads, the number of men who have *not* been accused steadily diminishes. Eventually a point is reached where initially sympathetic men understand that they themselves are no longer safe, that their innocence does not protect them or their jobs. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this point is being

reached in many workplaces. Men are developing a self-defensive code of avoiding all unnecessary words or contact with women. One hears stories about women entering break rooms full of merrily chatting male coworkers who look up and instantly lapse into tense, stony silence. A “hostile work environment” indeed.

A more serious development, however, is what has come to be known as the marriage strike. The first occurrence of this term appears to have been in a *Philadelphia Enquirer* editorial of 2002. Two years later, a formal study gave substance to the idea: Fully 22 percent of American bachelors aged 25–34 have resolved never to marry. 53 percent more say they are not interested in marrying any time soon. That leaves just 25 percent looking for wives. This may be a situation unprecedented in the history of the world.

Men do cite the availability of sex outside marriage as one reason for not marrying. But this does not mean that the problem could be solved simply by getting them to take vows (e.g., by shotgun marriage). Men now realize they stand to lose their children at a moment’s notice through no fault of their own if the mother decides to cash out of the marriage or “relationship” in Family Court. For this reason, many are refusing to father children *with or without* benefit of clergy. In Germany, which faces an even lower birthrate than America, the talk is already of a *Zengungsstreik*, literally a “procreation strike,” rather than a mere marriage strike. Some women suffering from what has come to be known as “babies-rabies” have resorted to lying to their men about using birth control. Of course, men are wising up to this as well.

No woman is *owed* economic support, children, respect, or love. The woman who accepts and lives by correct principles thereby earns the right to make certain demands upon her husband; being female entitles her to nothing.

Western women have been biting the hand that feeds them for several decades now. It seems to me fair to say that the majority have willfully forfeited the privilege of marrying decent men. It is time for men to abandon the protector role and tell them they are going to be “liberated” from us whether they wish it or not. They can hold down their own jobs, pay their own bills, live, grow old, and finally die by themselves. Every step which has brought them to this pass has involved an assertion of “rights” for themselves and male concessions to them. Men would seem justified in saying to them, with some *Schadenfreude*, “you made your bed, now you can lie in it—alone.”

Unfortunately, the matter cannot simply be allowed to rest here. Without children, the race has no future, and without women men cannot have children.

One well-established trend is the search for foreign wives. Predictably, efforts are underway by feminists to outlaw, or at least discourage this, and one law has already gotten through Congress (the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act of 2005). The ostensible reason is to protect innocent foreign lasses from “abuse”; the real reason to

protect spoiled, feminist-indoctrinated American women from foreign competition. Most of the economic arguments about protective tariffs for domestic industry apply here.

Feminists think in terms of governmental coercion. The idea of *eliciting* desirable male behavior does not occur to them. Some men are concerned that proposals for forced marriage may be in the offing.

Meanwhile, men have begun to realize that any sexual intimacy with a woman can lead to date rape charges based upon things that go on in her mind afterwards, and over which he has no control. Women do frequently attempt to evade responsibility for their sexual conduct by ascribing it to the men involved. Without any social or legal enforcement of marriage, this leaves chastity as a man's only means of self-defense.

A male sex strike was probably beyond the imagination even of Aristophanes. But I wouldn't underestimate men. We, and not women, have been the builders, sustainers, and defenders of civilization.

The latest word from college campuses is that women have begun to complain men are not asking them out. That's right: Men at their hormonal peak are going to class side by side with nubile young women who now outnumber them, and are simply ignoring or shunning them. Some report being repeatedly asked "Are you gay?" by frustrated coeds. This is what happens when women complain for forty years about being "used as sex objects": Eventually men stop using them as sex objects.

Not long ago I spotted a feminist recruitment poster at a local college. Most of it consisted of the word **FALSE** in bold capitals, visible from a distance. Underneath was something to the effect: "...that we're all man-hating maniacs," etc.; "Come join us and see."

When the most inspiring slogan a movement can come up with amounts to "We're not as bad as everyone says," you know it is in trouble.

What Is to Be Done?

We have arrived at a rare historical moment when we men have the upper hand in the battle of the sexes. Much depends upon the use we make of it. The only thing still propping up the present feminist-bureaucratic regime is the continued willingness of many of the hated "heterosexual white males" to live according to the old rules: not only to work, save, pay taxes, and obey the law, but also to sire and raise children. Once we stop doing these things, the whole system of patronage and parasitism collapses.

My greatest fear is that at the first female concessions, the male protective instinct will kick in once again and men will cheerfully shout "All is forgiven" in a stampede to the altar. This must not happen. Our first priority must be to put the divorce industry out of

business. A man must insist on nothing less than a legally binding promise to love, honor, and obey him before “consenting” to give a woman a baby.

One proposal for strengthening marriage is the recognition of personalized marriage contracts. These could be made to accord with various religious traditions. I see no reason they might not stipulate that the husband would vote on behalf of his family. Feminists who think political participation more important than family life could still live as they please, but they would be forced to make a clear choice. This would help erode the superstitious belief in a universal right to participate in politics, and political life itself would be less affected by the feminine tendencies to value security over freedom and to base public policies on sentiment. Property would also be more secure where the producers of wealth have greater political power.

Economic policy should be determined by the imperative to carry on our race and civilization. There is something wrong when everyone can afford a high-definition plasma TV with three hundred channels but an honest man of average abilities with a willingness to work cannot afford to raise a family.

Female mate selection has always had an economic aspect. Hesiod warned his male listeners in the seventh century B.C. that “hateful poverty they will not share, but only luxury.” This notorious facet of the female sexual instinct is the reason behind the words “for richer or for poorer” in the Christian marriage ceremony. The man must know he has a solid bargain whether or not he is as successful a provider as his wife (or he himself) might like.

Within the family, the provider must control the allotment of his wealth. The traditional community of property in a marriage, i.e., the wife’s claim to support from her husband, should again be made conditional on her *being* a wife to him. She may run off with the milkman if she wishes—leaving her children behind, of course (anyone willing to do this is perhaps an unfit mother in any case); but she may not evict her husband from his own house and *replace* him with the milkman, nor continue to extract resources from the husband she has abandoned. Until sensible reforms are instituted, men must refuse to leave themselves prey to a criminal regime which forces them to subsidize their own cuckolding and the abduction of their children.

The date rape issue can be solved overnight by restoring shotgun marriage—but with the shotgun at the woman’s back. The “victim” should be told to get into the kitchen and fix supper for her new lord and master. Not exactly a match made in heaven, but at least the baby will have both a father and a mother. Furthermore, after the birth of her child, the woman will have more important things to worry about than whether the act by which she conceived it accorded with some feminist professor’s newfangled notion of “true consent.” Childbirth has always been the best remedy for female narcissism.

Harassment accusations should be a matter of public record. This would make it possible to maintain lists of women with a history of making such charges for the benefit of employers and, far more importantly, potential suitors. Women might eventually reacquaint themselves with the old-fashioned idea that they have a reputation to protect.

Universal coeducation should be abandoned. One problem in relations between the sexes today is overfamiliarity. Young men are wont to assume that being around girls all the time will increase their chances of getting one. But familiarity is often the enemy of intimacy. When a girl only gets to socialize with young men at a dance once a week, she values the company of young men more highly. It works to the man's advantage not to be constantly in their company. Men, also, are most likely to marry when they do not understand women too well.

It is necessary to act quickly. It took us half a century to get into our present mess, but we do not have that long to get out of it. A single-generation *Zeugungsstreik* will destroy us. So we cannot wait for women to come to their senses; we must take charge and begin the painful process of unspoilng them.

How Monogamy Works

Traditionally, a man has been expected to marry. Bachelorhood was positively forbidden in some ancient European societies, including the early Roman republic. Others offered higher social status for husbands and relative disgrace for bachelors. There seems to have been a fear that the sexual instinct alone was inadequate to insure a sufficient number of offspring. Another seldom mentioned motive for the expectation of marriage was husbands' envy of bachelors: "Why should that fellow be free and happy when I am stuck working my life away to support an ungrateful creature who nags me?"

Strange as it sounds to modern ears, the Christian endorsement of celibacy was a *liberalization* of sexual morality; it recognized there could be legitimate motives for remaining unmarried. One social function of the celibate religious orders was to give that minority of men and women unsuited for or disinclined to marriage a socially acceptable way of avoiding it.

Obviously, an obligation of marrying implies the possibility of doing so. It was not difficult for an ordinary man to get a wife in times past. One reason is what I call the grandmother effect.

Civilization has been defined as the partial victory of age over youth. After several decades of married life, a woman looks back and finds it inconceivable that she once considered a man's facial features an important factor in mate selection. She tries to talk some sense into her granddaughter before it is too late. "Don't worry about what he looks like; don't

worry about how he makes you feel; that isn't important." If the girl had a not especially glamorous but otherwise unexceptionable suitor (the sort who would be charged with harassment today), she might take the young man's part: "If you don't catch this fellow while you can, some smarter girl will." So it went, generation after generation. This created a healthy sense of competition for decent, as opposed to merely sexually attractive, men. Husbands often never suspected the grandmother effect, living out their lives in the comforting delusion that their wives married them solely from recognition of their outstanding merits. But today grandma has been replaced by *Cosmopolitan*, and the results are there for all to see.

Much confusion has been caused by attempting to get women to say what it is they want from men. Usually they bleat something about "a sensitive man with a good sense of humor." But this is continually belied by their behavior. Any man who believes it is in for years of frustration and heartbreak. What they actually look for when left to their own devices (i.e., without any grandmother effect) is a handsome, socially dominant, or wealthy man. Many prefer married men or philanderers; some actively seek out criminals.

In a deeper sense, though, humans necessarily want happiness, as the philosopher says. During most of history no one tried to figure out what young women wanted; they were simply *told* what they wanted, viz., a good husband. This was the correct approach. Sex is too important a matter to be left to the independent judgment of young women, because young women rarely possess good judgment. The overwhelming majority of women will be happier in the long run by marrying an ordinary man and having children than by seeking sexual thrills, ascending the corporate heights, or grinding out turgid tracts on gender theory. A woman develops an emotional bond with her mate through the sexual act itself; this is why arranged marriages (contrary to Western prejudice) are often reasonably happy. Romantic courtship has its charms, but is finally dispensable; marriage is not dispensable.

Finally, heterosexual monogamy is incompatible with equality of the sexes. A wife always has more influence on home life, if only because she spends more time there; a husband's leadership often amounts to little more than an occasional veto upon some of his wife's decisions. But such leadership is necessary to accommodate female hypergamy. Women want a man they can look up to; they leave or fall out of love with men they do not respect. Hence, men really have no choice in the matter.

Once more, we find nearly perfect agreement between feminist radicals and plenty of conservatives in failing to understand this, with men getting the blame from both sides. Feminists protest that "power differentials" between the sexes—meaning, really, differences in status or authority—make genuine sexual consent impossible. In a similar vein, the stern editor of *Chronicles* laments that "in the case of a college professor who sleeps with an 18-year-old student, disparity in age or rank should be grounds for

regarding the professor as a rapist. But professors who prey upon girls are not sent to jail. They do not even lose their jobs.”

In fact, this is just one more example of hypergamous female mate selection. In most marriages, the husband is at least slightly older than the wife. Normal women tend to be attracted precisely to men in positions of authority. Nurses do tend to choose doctors, secretaries their bosses, and the occasional female student will choose a professor; this does not mean the men are abusing any “power” to force helpless creatures to mate with them.

I submit that a man’s “preying upon” a younger women of lower rank should be grounds for regarding him as a husband. Men are *supposed* to have authority over women; that is part of what a marriage is. Equality of the sexes makes men less attractive to women; it has probably contributed significantly to the decline in Western birthrates. It is time to put an end to it.

Conclusion

Marriage *is* an institution; it places artificial limits on women’s choices. To repeat: Nature dictates that males display and females choose. Monogamy artificially strengthens the male’s position by insisting that (1) each female must choose a different male; and (2) each female must stick to her choice. Monogamy entails that highly attractive men are removed from the mating pool early, usually by the most attractive women. The next women are compelled to choose a less attractive mate if they wish to mate at all. Even the last and least of the females can, however, find a mate: For every girl there is a boy. Abolishing marriage only strengthens the naturally stronger: it strengthens the female at the expense of the male and the attractive at the expense of the unattractive.

Marriage, like most useful things, was probably invented by men: partly to keep the social peace, partly so they could be certain their wives’ children were also their own. The consequences of marriage must have appeared soon after its institution: The efforts previously spent fighting over mates were replaced by strenuous exertions to provide for, rear, and defend offspring. No doubt neighboring tribes wondered why this one had recently grown so much more powerful. When they learned the reason, imitation must have seemed a matter of survival.

It was, and it still is. If the Occident does not restore marriage, we will be overwhelmed by those who continue to practice it.

F. Roger Devlin is the author of *Alexandre Kojève and the Outcome of Modern Thought*. His article, "Sexual Utopia in Power," was originally published in the Summer 2006 issue of *The Occidental Quarterly*. The endnotes have been omitted.

White nationalists' amnesty to non-whites - I

“White Nationalists treat Mediterraneans
like Republicans treat Mestizos.”

—Vance Stubbs

Portugal and the one-drop rule

by Smith et al

Ray Smith

In view of the fact that we are now being forced to integrate with the Negroes and grant them equal participation, it might be instructive to look at other countries which have integrated with Negroes in the past to see what the Negroes gave them. What is the historical evidence?

There is a wealth of material here for study in such places as Haiti, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Brazil, etc., but the nearest parallel to the United States today is Portugal in the 16th century.

It may come as a surprise to hear of the Negroes' role in the history of Portugal, for in spite of all the emphasis on "Black studies" in our schools, no one seems to talk about the Blacks' contribution to Portugal—neither the Portuguese, the Blacks, nor our modern historians who are rewriting our history books to make the Negroes look good. It takes considerable digging in books written before our modern era of forced integration to uncover the story of Portugal.

Poets and explorers

By the middle of the 16th century, Portugal had risen to a position analogous to that of the United States today. Portugal was the wealthiest, most powerful country in the world, with a large empire and colonies in Asia, Africa and America. The Portuguese people were, like the Elizabethans in England, poets and explorers, a race of highly civilized, imaginative, intelligent, and daring people. They showed great potential and had already made important contributions to the Renaissance. But, unlike England and other European countries, Portugal had a large and rapidly growing Negro population and, at the same time, its white population was declining.

Portugal began the Negro slave trade after encountering Negroes in its explorations and forays into Africa. Portugal brought the first Black slaves to Lisbon in 1441, and they continued to be imported in such numbers that by 1550, the population of Portugal was 10 percent Negro (the U.S. is 13-14 percent Negro today).

Defilement of the blood

There was no taboo or injunction against sexual relations with the Negroes, and the Negroes' blood soon became assimilated into the general population through miscegenation, so that today there are no Negroes, as such, in Portugal. The present-day population of Portugal is described by the *New York Times Encyclopedic Almanac*, 1971, as follows: "Ethnic Composition: The people are a mixture of various ethnic strains, including Celtic, Arab, Berber, Phoenician, Carthaginian, Lusitanian, and other racial influences. The present population is one of the most homogeneous in Europe, with no national minorities." (Note that the Negro strain is not listed by the *New York Times*).

What you can see in Portugal today is the product of uniform, non-selective mixing of the 10 percent Negroes and 90 percent Whites into one homogeneous whole. In effect, it is a new race—a race that has stagnated in apathy and produced virtually nothing in the last 400 years.

The *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., 1911, in its article on Portugal states, "The Portuguese intermarried freely with their slaves, and this infusion of alien blood profoundly modified the character and physique of the nation. It may be said without exaggeration that the Portuguese of the 'age of discoveries' and the Portuguese of the 17th and later centuries were two different races."

The contribution of this new race to civilization in terms of literature, art, music, philosophy, science, etc. has been practically nothing. Portugal today is the most backwards country in Europe.

Portugal and America

In spite of the close similarity between the situation of Portugal in the 1550's and the United States today, we cannot predict that the outcome of our racial integration with Negroes will be exactly the same. The historical significance, however, is that any country, society, or group which has integrated to any appreciable extent with the Negroes has suffered drastically in its ability to maintain a civilized standard of living and its ability to compete with others. There is no evidence that any other country ever gained anything from integration with Negroes.

It should be pointed out that the Negro-White ratio, 1:9, in Portugal in the 1550's does not represent the final percentage of Negro genes, for the Negro element was rapidly increasing while the White element was declining. The male Whites were leaving Portugal in large numbers—sailing, settling in the colonies, and marrying native women (the government encouraged this). Most of the Negro slaves brought to Portugal were adult males. The population was thus unbalanced—an excess of White women and Negro males, and a shortage of White men. Chronicles of the era relate that Portuguese women kept Negro slaves as “pets.” They also married them.

The situation in the U.S. today is not too different. The radical-chic Whites have their Black pets. Our percentage of the Negro element today does not represent the final amalgam. The Negro birth rate is almost twice as high as that of the Whites. There is no White population explosion in America, or anywhere in the world. It is all colored. The colored woman has the children; the White women are on the pill or have abortions.

What the final amalgam in America will be we can not say, but if the present trends continue, the Negro element will be much more than 14 percent.

Why did Portugal integrate?

The British, French, Dutch, Spanish, and Portuguese all engaged in the Negro slave trade, but only Portugal brought them to their own country. The question arises—why did Portugal so willingly accept racial integration with Negroes while other European countries kept the Negroes out and maintained their racial integrity? What was the climate of opinion, the current ideology, teaching, or propaganda that led the Portuguese to depart from the behavior of the other countries? What was the difference about Portugal?

You will not find the answer to these questions in our modern history books and recently published encyclopedias, for the whole subject of the decline has become taboo. You will have to dig into older sources and discover your own answers. You might also ask yourself why America is accepting racial integration while most of the rest of the world is “racist.” Why are we different?

History rewritten

Our encyclopedias and history books have been purged and rewritten. If you look up Portugal in the 1970 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, you will not find anything about the role of the Negroes and Jews in the history of Portugal, or anything about the decline and fall of Portugal. The Jews are briefly mentioned among others who “exerted various

influences over the territory which in the 13th century acquired the frontiers of modern Portugal.” There is no elaboration of what this influence was.

The Negroes have been eliminated entirely. They are not listed with the other ethnic groups in the ancestry of the Portuguese people. In the entire 15-page article, there is no clue that Negroes were ever present in Portugal or that they had any role or influence in Portuguese history. The 1970 edition of the *Encyclopedia Americana* also makes no mention of the presence of Negroes in Portugal.



Blacks and Jews: Jewish police officers haul away a black man in this anonymous depiction of a Lisbon street scene (Walters Art Museum)

In all these sources you find “facts,” i.e., names and dates, but with no meaning and no indication of what actually happened or why. However, if you can manage to find some older sources, you can learn a great deal about the history of Portugal.

The article on Portugal in the 1911 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* contains more real information than you can get in reading a hundred history books of more recent vintage. From our modern point of view, this article would probably be called “racist,” but the point is that the presence and activities of the Negroes and Jews are recorded. The information is there, and you can draw your own conclusions. The article is actually pro-Jewish. There is also a scholarly analysis of the factors in the decline and fall of Portugal, with the author tending to blame the Inquisition, the Jesuits, and anti-Semitism. However, neither his conclusions nor his bias prevents him from including factors or information which might lead the reader to a different conclusion.

Our modern scholars and authorities eliminate information which might lead the reader to the “wrong” conclusion.

Suppressing the evidence

The 1964 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* still briefly lists the Negroes and Jews, along with others, as Portuguese racial elements, but with no details or elaborations. By 1966, the Negroes have vanished completely.

Now, what has happened between 1911 and 1966 that makes us purge and rewrite history in such a way? Have we decided that race no longer is, or ever was, a factor in history? This cannot be, since “Black Studies” are flourishing at our universities. Historians are supposedly trying hard to discover all they can about the role of the Negroes in history.

In a trial, a lawyer tries to suppress evidence that would be damaging to his client. He tries to prevent this evidence from reaching the jury. Our modern historians and scholars are trying to suppress evidence. The Negro is their client. We are the jury—and we must not reach the “wrong” verdict.

Liberals in the United States often became very self-righteous and superior when the former Soviet Union purged and rewrote its encyclopedias, eliminating from its history current undesirables and making them “unpersons.” We ridicule their lack of objectivity and irrational scholarship. But we do exactly the same thing when we rewrite history of Portugal and make “unpersons” of the Negroes (and Jews). In terms of rewriting and deliberately falsifying history, we are much closer to Orwell’s *1984* than the Soviet Union ever was. Big Brother protects us from dangerous knowledge.

Quo Vadis, Aryan man

There is a great need for the American people to know what happened in Portugal in the 16th century, for we are repeating their experience. We are in the same predicament, at the same juncture, at the same crossroads in history. There is an amazing similarity between our situation today and Portugal’s in the 1500’s. Shall we take the same road?

Travelers from other European countries were amazed to see so many Negroes in 16th-century Lisbon, as are travelers today in Washington, D.C. Our own capital is a large percentage Black, and, as was the case in Lisbon, the Negroes do all the manual labor and service jobs. The 1911 *Encyclopedia Britannica* comments, “While the country was being drained of its best citizens, hordes of slaves were imported to fill the vacancies, especially into the southern provinces. Manual labor was thus discredited; the peasants sold their farms and emigrated or flocked to the towns; and small holdings were merged into vast estates.”

In analyzing the catastrophe which befell Portugal, the historian H. Morse Stephens (in his book, *Portugal*, written in 1891) concludes:

They [the Portuguese] were to produce great captains and writers, and were able to become the wealthiest nation in Europe. But that same sixteenth century was to see the Portuguese power sink, and the independence, won by Alfonso Henriques and maintained by John the Great, vanish away; it was to see Portugal, which had been one of the greatest nations of its time, decline in fame, and become a mere province of Spain. Hand in hand with increased wealth came corruption and depopulation, and within a single century after the epoch-making voyage of Vasco da Gamma, the Portuguese people, tamed by the Inquisition, were to show no sign of their former hardihood. This is the lesson that the story of Portugal in the sixteenth century teaches: that the greatness of a nation depends not upon its wealth and commercial prosperity, but upon the thews and sinews and the stout hearts of its people.

This is rather old-fashioned language, but what Stephens is saying is that, by the end of the 16th century, the quality of the people was lacking. Other European nations suffered military defeat, but continued to grow and develop. Portugal stopped dead in its tracks. It had nothing to build on. Portugal can now only look nostalgically to the past. We Americans must use this information as insight into our future. It is too late to save the White Aryan people of Portugal, but we must save ourselves.

Arthur Kemp

Spain and Portugal are two countries in Western Europe which have both been marked by phases of great wealth and power and then decline—the classic characteristics of the rise and fall of civilizations. Bearing in mind the lessons already manifest from the ancient civilizations, it is therefore easy to look for the population shifts which, as always, closely track the rise and fall of all civilizations. As to be expected with both Spain and Portugal, the population changes are also evident—and are also directly linked to the leading and then reduced roles these nations have played in not only White history, but also of world history.

One of the first laws which the Gothic kingdom in Spain established was a ban on all mixed marriages. Goths were only allowed to marry Goths, and punishment for violating this ban was burning at the stake. This overtly racial law kept the intermixing of Goths with all others to an absolute minimum—and particularly with the growing Jewish population. Gothic Spain settled down into a period of relative peace and resultant prosperity, with the only discordant note being sounded by the large Jewish population.

Wamba's predecessor, Recceswinth, had taken a step which was to have far reaching consequences. He abolished the long standing ban on mixed marriages, replacing it with a

law stating that anyone of Christian beliefs was allowed to marry anyone else of similar beliefs. Henceforth the only ban on intermarriage would be on religious grounds, not racial. This step allowed any person of any racial origin, as long as they professed Christianity, to intermarry and mix with the Goths. In this way the first steps were taken that would lead towards the dissolution of the Gothic tribe in Spain.

Editor's note: Recceswinth was the Visigothic King of Hispania, Septimania and Galicia in 649–672. In his book Kemp proceeds to describe the following centuries. Then he writes of Spain's Golden Age reproducing the below illustration of El Greco.



Racial divisions emerge. This famous painting by El Greco (1548-1614), *Saint Martin and the Beggar*, is a vivid depiction of the emerging division of Spain into those who had mixed with the non-White Muslims and those who had not. Saint Martin is portrayed as completely White. The beggar is clearly of mixed race.

The change in the racial face of Spain, combined with its disastrous European wars, brought about that country's decline as a great power, perfectly in line with the law that societies create cultures in the image of their populations, and change those societal norms as their populations change. Spain is a significant example of this principle, because, like Italy after the Germanic Lombard invasion, that country essentially became a bi-racial nation: White in the North, with a gradually darkening population to the south.

By 1648, Spain had been so weakened that it conceded Dutch independence in that year. French provinces were handed back to France in 1659, and Portugal was once again granted independence in 1668.

A personal communication by Larry Mars

I've just read the article about Portugal [Ray Smith's, abridged above]. It's awesome, very educative.

I think you remember that I said that in 19th-century Portuguese novels you never see Blacks in the plots. Despite that, I also said that there is something weird about the Portuguese as far as race is concerned, because those folks are palpably more stupid than other Europeans by and large, and I went on to mention that in Southern Portugal the Arab/Northern African racial admixture with the locals through the centuries probably had been considerable. Now, do you remember a post you prepared for your blog, concerning the frailty of the White genetic material, whose good qualities are lost by any minimum admixture with non-white genetic input? I found it so striking I even translated it [to Portuguese] and posted it on my blog.

Well, if you put together all these data I think you have a reasonable explanation for what happened to Portugal: Until the 14th century, there had been some Arab/North African amalgamation in the south, but the north remained more or less intact. In the course of the 15th century, due to Portugal's conquests in Africa, dozens of thousands of Negroes were brought to the country, especially to Lisbon. Since there had never been anything like a racial consciousness in Portugal, racial amalgamation was rife and unchecked. Then, after a few generations, the country imploded economically and became the cultural/economic backwater we see today, especially if we keep in mind that the Black influx into Portugal most likely went on for the following centuries.

In other words, the one-drop rule should indeed be heeded. A relatively small-level racial intermixing on the part of the Portuguese was enough to destroy their character as a White people, even if not enough to give the average Portuguese of today a distinctively Black/Arab/Northern African phenotype. Choices have consequences indeed...

As soon as I started reading those online articles [critical of both Smith and Kemp's views on Portugal] I realized they were the work of Portuguese antifas who call Kemp a racist and, paradoxically, at the same time try hard to prove their country is not a Negroes' nation. Pathetic.

The passage you sent me from Wikipedia says everything, and I'd like to draw your attention to the following data:

In Iberia the mean frequency of Haplogroup L lineages reaches 3.83% and *the frequency is higher in Portugal* (5.83%) than in Spain (2.90%) *and without parallel in the rest of Europe.* [emphasis by Mars]

Now, and this is really important, you can't lose sight of something: since the slave traffic into Portugal must have ended at some point between the 18th and 19th century, in the meantime (at least until the 1960's and 70's, when apparently there was a resurgence of African Black immigration into the country), the amount of Black blood among the general population necessarily decreased over time. Therefore, this 5.83% mentioned above certainly was an even higher figure a couple of centuries ago. And now that Blacks are once more migrating *en masse* to Portugal, the risk they might run of becoming a White nation again in the future has definitely been removed.

About the allegations one of the articles tries to make to the effect that Portugal is no backwater, that it has a vibrant culture which unfortunately is not given attention by the big media... bull. Ever since Camões, arguably the greatest European poet in the 16th century after Shakespeare, the only relevant contributions the country has given to Europe are 19th-century novelist Eça de Queiroz and 20th-century poet Fernando Pessoa. It is true that the insufferable José Saramago won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1998, but so what? Even Toni Morrison won it—although Tolstoy, Joyce and Borges didn't. In fact, I'm surprised Paulo Coelho hasn't received it yet. The antifas in Stockholm will bestow prizes to their brothers anyway and commie Saramago would do just as well as any other.

Editor's note

Above I reproduced my abridgement of Ray Smith's "The Black Man's Gift to Portugal" (*The Best of Attack and National Vanguard Tabloid* Ref: Issue No. 6, 1971); Arthur Kemp's more recent views on Portugal in *March of the Titans* (op. cit.), and the comments of a friend whose native language is Portuguese (*The West's Darkest Hour*, January 23, 2013).

He who controls the past controls the future. An Orwellian rewriting of racial history has been, predictably, one of the activities of our anti-white culture since the last century. What is disturbing is that the history of the miscegenation of the Iberian peninsula has been downplayed by white nationalists, many still under the grip of egalitarianism among the Europeans.

As seen in my abridged version of *Who We Are*, "Aryan" is a popular term for Europeans of almost pure Indo-European heritage. In the United States "white" used to refer to

those Americans produced by interbreeding among Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Scandinavian, Celtic or Irish peoples.

Not so today. Quite a few white nationalists want to grant amnesty not only to the Portuguese but to those Spanish, southern Italians, Greeks and inhabitants of the former Yugoslavia whose ancestors mixed with the Moors, Turks, Levantines and Jewish or non-Jewish Semites. (I am not saying that all Portuguese, Spaniards, Italians, Greeks, etc., are non-whites: only that many of them clearly are not.)

In the past I asked myself many times why the two distinct histories of the white race authored respectively by William Pierce and Arthur Kemp are not bestsellers, or even commonly mentioned, in the so-called white nationalist movement. It took me a couple of years to figure out the answer.

Like self-conscious conservatives, white nationalists are all too shy to face the most brutal truths about their race. One of such brutalities is the necessity of ethnic cleansing, even if that includes genocide (one of the subjects of my personal essays for another book) in the coming racial wars. Another truth is that Aryans are on the verge of extinction because so-called “Mediterraneans” are not the original European Mediterraneans at all, but have considerable non-white blood in their veins. While I perfectly understand that people like the Portuguese hate to be called semi-niggers, being extremely sensitive to the feelings of others among Aryan white nationalists verges on surrealism.

A friendly exchange between a blogger and I shreds some light into this subject.

Who is really “white” or “Aryan”?

by Vance Stubbs

It’s really a microcosm of society at large isn’t it? “I know a swarthy Italian and he’s really pro-White!” “If you alienate Greeks they won’t vote for you or buy your stuff!” “I’m not Nordicist: some of my best friends are black (-haired)!”

But it goes beyond that. How many white nationalists are willing to outright say that women, as a biological class, should not have the same legal powers as men? That homosexuals are mentally diseased and shouldn’t be allowed to run rampant? That most people simply aren’t intelligent enough to make important social or political decisions, and that society needs to restrict their behavior unless it wants to become a consumerist MTV hellhole? That in many cases good people should be stopped from reproducing because they have bad genes? That industrial society will always cause genetic devolution unless a *comprehensive and mandatory* eugenic system is in place? That the world’s resources are finite and bloody conflict over them is an existential fact, unless one faction already has uncontested martial supremacy? That religion and culture can uplift or destroy a society, and cannot be left a “personal choice” by a true revolutionary? That biologically and mentally superior groups of humans lived before us and will probably live after us, and we will never be their equals? That *The Beatles* mostly sucked?

So it’s definitely an axiomatic thing. Modern whites can’t accept that a human can be unequal to another—and thus superior or inferior—as an existential quality, and not as a result of some “choice” or sin. This does indeed seem like a problem greatly inflamed by Christian metaphysics, where equal essential being (the soul) is assumed, and only “free will” (faith or sin) distinguishes humans from one another in an ultimate sense.

“Nordicism” among white nationalists is almost identical to the response to “racism” in society at large. Thus, White Nationalists treat Mediterraneans like Republicans treat Mestizos: they put emotional *non-sequiturs* up against biological facts, and they wind up trotting out “token Italians” because accusations of an organization being “Nordic” in white nationalism are taken like accusations of an organization being “all white” in the mainstream. We’ve just fallen into the same mentality.

I'm not even really in agreement with Covington; I don't consider the Greeks to be basically Turks, I place them on the white side of the line, but I can recognize they've undergone some degree of mongrelization and that this would constitute genetic damage in an Aryan nation. Not all genetic damage is caused by mongrelization, and my guess is that all humans have genetic flaws of some type. Nonetheless some are much more damaged than others; in extreme cases this results in classification as a non-white or as a deformed/botched white, with exile in the former case and total sterilization or euthanization in the later case is the most sensible solution. In less severe cases the damage should be handled by a comprehensive eugenic system, which would use racial purity as a major (but not the only) determinant of genetic quality.

Psychologically though, I don't think the "Nordicist" thing is being handled well, and the "transvaluation" thing comes back to light.

I responded:

"I don't consider the Greeks to be basically Turks, I place them on the White side of the line..."

You meant *on the olive-color* side, not on the white side. See the Metapedia article, "Von Lushan's skin color scale": a chromatic scale of the thirty-six human skin colors from the purest white to the blackest. On the left column you will see there more subtle white gradations of color, undistinguishable at first glance. Most modern Greeks fall in-between real whiteness and the colored.

Vance Stubbs responded:

I meant in terms of allowing them in the Aryan state and attempting to repair any genetic degradation versus banishing them from the state and telling them to form their own country. I don't think, for instance, that we'd bother trying to "restore" the Aryan genotype of someone like Obama: we'd just tell him to go live in New Liberia or wherever. At some point a human drifts so far from our race we write them off as an alien politically, but I don't think many Greeks are there yet.

The problem is white nationalists still have an equality-based mindset. They think once you pass through the walls of the Fourth Reich and get a stamp that says "White" on it you're just like everyone else inside the walls. Basically they want America without niggers, like you said; universal suffrage, freedom of religion, *gubmint stayin outta my business*, no biological program once everybody in the country is "White enough" to gain entrance, utilitarian goals for making people "happy" and "free" at the expense of anything higher, etcetera.

Pointing out an obvious fact like some “Whites” being purer than others (did you really expect the people who were occupied by the Moors or Turks for 300 years to be comparable to the Swedes?) throws them into fits. Not only does it retrigger all the anti-racist conditioning they thought they’d gotten rid of, but it makes them ask “where does it end?” “At what point can we finally stop paying attention to each others genetic (and non-genetic) flaws?”

The answer is that it doesn’t end: that all life is struggle and hierarchy and that the Aryan race will never be perfected nor entirely freed from threats. But that’s not what they want to hear.

Pierce made eugenics the core of his religious outlook as a means of protecting the eugenically-selecting society. But I see little concern for the subject among modern white nationalists. Can you imagine a racial state with a comprehensive eugenic policy which *didn’t* consider the reversal of mongrelization to be a major objective? That it *wouldn’t* make its population look more like Swedes and less like Sicilians, as time goes on? It’s hard to do so, which is why I believe “anti-Nordicism” in white nationalism has, among other things, shut down much of the discussion on the subject.

The West’s Darkest Hour, October 8, 2013.

The face of classical Europe (I): Were the Greeks blond and blue-eyed?

Translated from the Spanish blogsite *Europa Soberana*

I remember a movie that came out in 2004. *Troy* was called. Naturally, many fans of Greece went to see it interested; some of them because they sincerely admired Hellas and its legacy. But some uncultivated specimens attended the theaters too. Everyone knows that, in our day, Greece is regarded as a mark of snobbery and sophistication even though you do not know who Orion was, or what was the color of Achilles' hair according to mythology. The movie's Helen (one with a look of a neighborhood slut) and Achilles (Brad Pitt) were rather cute. Adding the special effects, advertising and usual movie attendance there was no reason not to see this movie that, incidentally, is crap except for a few redeemable moments.

Upon first glance at the big screen, one of the many reactions that could be heard from the mouth of alleged scholarly individuals, was something like the following:

Outrageous: Achilles and Helen, blond and blue-eyed! Oh tragedy! Oh tantrum! Such a huge stupidity! Irreparable affront! It is obvious that Nazism, fascism, Nordicism, Francoism, anti-Semitism, homophobia and sexism are booming in Hollywood, because who would have the crazy notion to represent the Greeks as blond, when their phenotype was Mediterranean? Only the Americans could be so uneducated and egocentric and ethnocentric and Eurocentric and fascists and Nazis and blah blah...

These good people were not outraged by the desecration of *The Iliad*; for the absurd and fallacious script, for representing Achilles like an Australian surfer, or Helen as a cunt or the great kings as truckers of a brothel. No. They didn't give a hoot about that. What mattered was leaving very clearly that they were sophisticated people, conscious of what was happening and that, besides being progressive democrats and international multiculturalists without blemish, and able to pronounce "phenotype" without binding the tongue, they were also sufficiently "sincere admirers of Greece" to be indignant and losing their monocles before a blond Achilles.

The same could be said for the ultra-educated reaction to the movie *300*. When it was released, we could see an outraged mass (and when we say “outraged” we are saying really outraged) complaining in the most grotesque way, by the presence here and there, of blond Spartans throughout the movie—fascist xenophobia by Hollywood and the like. How easy it is for the big mouths when there are large doses of daring ignorance involved, and when they have no idea what it stands to reason.

What I did not expect was to hear similar statements from the admirers of classical culture: people that one generously assumes they have read the Greco-Roman works or that are minimally informed—at least enough to not put one’s foot in it in a such a loudly manner. For Achilles, considered the greatest warrior of all time, and sole and exclusive holder of the holy anger, is described in *The Iliad* as blond, along with an overwhelming proportion of heroes, heroines, gods, goddesses—and even slaves considered desirable and worthy for the harem of the Greek warriors to seed the world with good genes.

The same could be said of the Spartans if we consider the physical appearance of their northern Dorian ancestors, who had come “among the snows” according to Herodotus. In fact, the movie *300* was too generous with the number of Spartans of dark hair, and too stingy with the number of blonds.

Whoever declares himself an admirer of classical European culture (Greece and Rome) and, at the same time, asserts that it was founded by swarthy, Mediterraneans-like-me folks is placing himself in the most uncomfortable form of self-consciousness. As I have said, if such individual really admired the classical world and bothered to read the classical works, he would have ascertained to what extent Nordic blood prevailed in the leaders of both Greece and Rome—especially in Greece. In short, those who claim being ultra-fans of Greece, Rome or both only throw garbage on themselves by demonstrating that they had not even read the original writings.

There are many truths about Nordic blood and Hellas but perhaps the most eloquent and overwhelming truth is that Greek literature is full of references to the *appearance* of the heroes and gods because the Greeks liked to place adjectives on all the characters, and nicknames and epithets representing their presence. So much so that it is really hard to find a darker character. In the case, for example, of Pindar, it is a real scandal: there is not a single character that is not “blonde,” “golden,” “white,” “of snowy arms,” and therefore “godlike.”

The blue eyes were described as *γλανκώπις* (*glaukōpis*), which derives from *γλαῦκος* (*glaukos*), “brilliant,” “shiny.” The Roman writer Aulus Gellius, in his *Attic Nights* describes the concept of colors in a conversation between a Greek and a Roman. The Roman tells the Greek that *glaucum* (from which derives the Castilian *glaucous*) means gray-blue, and the Greek translates *glaukōpis* into Latin as *caesia*, “sky,” i.e., sky blue. As Günther observes, the very word “iris,” of Greek origin, that describes the color of the eye, could only have

been chosen by a people whom clear and bright eye colors dominated (blue, green or gray), and that a predominately swarthy people would have never compared the eye color with the image of the rainbow.

The Greek word for blond was *ξανθός* (*xanthus*), “yellow,” “gold,” “blond.” The *xanthus* color in the hair, as well as extreme beauty, light skin, high height, athletic build and luminous eyes were considered by the Greeks as proof of divine descent.

The physical appearance of Greek gods and heroes

Below, Demeter as it was conceived by the Greeks. We must remember that the statues had a deeply sacred and religious character for the Hellenes and that, in addition of being works of art, they were also the height of geometric feeling and engineering, since the balance had to be perfect. The Greeks, who had a great knowledge of the analyses of features, represented in their statues not only beautiful people, but beautiful people with a necessarily beautiful soul.



There is a persistent tendency among the Hellenes to describe their idols as “dazzling,” “radiant,” “shiny,” “bright,” “full of light,” etc., something that very obviously correspond to a barely pigmented, “Nordic” appearance. To be more direct, I’ll omit these ambiguous quotes and focus on the concrete: the specific references to the color of skin, eyes, hair, and more. Where possible I’ve inserted the works, specific chapters and verses so that anyone can refer to the original passage.

- Demeter is described as “the blonde Demeter” in *The Iliad* (Song V: 500) and in *Hymn to Demeter* (I: 302), based on the mysteries of Eleusis. It is generally considered a matriarchal

and telluric goddess from the East and of the pre-Indo-European peoples of Greece. However, here we should be inclined to think that, at best, she was a Europeanized goddess by the Greeks, integrated into their pantheon. The very name of Demeter comes from *Dea Mater* (Mother Goddess) and therefore would, in a sense, be the counterpart of *Deus Pater*—Zeus Pater or Jupiter, *Dyaus Piter*.

- Persephone, daughter of Demeter, is described as “white-armed” by Hesiod (*Theogony*: 913). At least it is clear here that Persephone was not a brown skinned goddess, nor that her physique coincided with the “Mediterranean” type. It is more reasonable to assume that her appearance was, at best, predominantly Nordic.
- Athena, the daughter of Zeus, goddess of wisdom, insight, cunning and strategic warfare in *The Iliad*, is described no more no less than a total of 57 times as “blue eyed” (in some variations, “green eyed”), and in *The Odyssey* a comparable number of times. Pindar referred to her as *xanthus* and *glaukopis*, meaning “blonde, blue-eyed.” Hesiod is content to call her “of green eyes” in his *Theogony* (15, 573, 587, 890 and 924), as well as Alcaeus and Simonides; while the Roman Ovid, in his *Metamorphoses*, which tells the perdition of Arachne, calls the goddess “manly and blond maiden.”
- Hera, the heavenly wife of Zeus, is called “white-armed” by Hesiod (*Theogony*, 315), while Homer called her “of snowy arms” and “white-armed goddess” at least thirteen times in *The Iliad* (I: 55, 195, 208, 572. 595, III 121, V: 775, 784; VIII: 350, 381, 484; XV: 78, 130).
- Zephyrus, the progenitor of Eros along with Iris, is described by Alcaeus (VII-VI centuries BCE) as “golden hair Zephyr” (*Hymn to Eros*, fragment V, 327).
- Eros, the god of eroticism, considered “the most terrible of the gods,” is described by an unknown, archaic Greek author as “golden-haired Eros.”
- Below, Apollo as it was conceived by the very Greek sculptors. We are talking about a Nordic-white racial type slightly Armenized. Along with Athena, he was the most worshiped god throughout Greece, and particularly loved in Sparta.

Apollo is described by Alcaeus as “fair-haired Phoebus.” Phoebus is Apollo. On the other hand, Alcman of Sparta, Simonides (paean to Delos, 84), and an anonymous author, call Apollo “of golden hair,” while another epithet of his by Góngora—a Spanish author of the Renaissance but based on classic literary evidence—is “blond archpoet.” The famous Sappho of Lesbos speaks of “golden-haired Phoebus” in his hymn to Artemis.



- The god Rhadamanthus, son of Zeus and Europa, is described as blond in *The Odyssey*, and Strabo calls him “the blond Rhadamanthus” in his *Geographica* (Book III, 11-13).
- Dionysus is called by Hesiod “golden-haired” (*Theogony* 947).
- Hecate, goddess of the wilderness and also of the Parthians, is described by an unknown Greek poet as “golden haired Hecate, daughter of Zeus.”



- Artemis (above), the sister of Apollo is described by Sappho and Anacreon (*Hymn to Artemis*) as “blond daughter of Zeus.”

- The goddess Thetis, mother of Achilles, is called by Hesiod “of silver feet” (*Theogony* 1007), and by Homer “of silvery feet” (*Iliad*, I: 538, 556, IX : 410; XVI : 574, XVIII : 369, 381, XIV:89). Needless to say that a brown-skinned woman cannot have silvery feet: this is an attribute of extremely pale women.
- The Eunice and Hipponoe mermaids are described as “rosy-armed” by Hesiod (*Theogony*, ll. 240-264).



- Aphrodite (above), daughter of Zeus, goddess of love, beauty and female eroticism, is always described as a blonde. Its conventional title is almost always “Golden Aphrodite.” Ibycus (in *Ode to Polycrates*) calls Aphrodite “Cypris of blond hair.” Aphrodite held the title of Cypris (Lady of Cyprus) because the Greeks believed she was born in Cyprus, where she was particularly revered. In Hesiod’s *Theogony* she is called “golden Aphrodite” (824, 962, 975, 1006 and 1015) and “very golden Aphrodite” (980). In Homer’s *Iliad* we have “Aura Aphrodite” (IX: 389), and in *The Odyssey* as “golden haired.”
- The Graces were described by Ibycus as “green eyed” (fragment papery, *PMG* 288).

Above I listed Wilhelm Sieglin’s conclusions regarding the Hellenic pantheon as a whole. Let us now see the heroes.

- Helen, considered the most beautiful woman ever and an indirect cause of the Trojan War, was described by Stesichorus, Sappho (first book of poems, Alexandrian compilation) and Ibycus as “the blonde Helen” (*Ode to Polycrates*).

- King Menelaus of Sparta, absolute model of noble warrior, brother of Agamemnon and legitimate husband of Helen is many times “the blond Menelaus” both in *The Iliad* (a minimum of fourteen times, III: 284, IV: 183, 210, X: 240, XI: 125; XVII: 6, 18, 113, 124, 578, 673, 684, XXIII: 293, 438) and *The Odyssey*. Peisander described him as *xanthokómes*, *mégas en glaukómmatos*, meaning “blond of big blue eyes.” In Greek mythology, Menelaus is one of the few heroes who achieved immortality in the Islands of the Blessed.
- Cassandra, the daughter of Agamemnon and sister of Orestes, is described by Philoxenus of Cythera with “golden curls,” and by Ibycus as “green-eyed Cassandra.”
- Meleager is described as “the blond Meleager” by Homer (*Iliad*, II: 642), and in his *Argonautica* Apollonius of Rhodes also describes him as blond.
- Patroclus, the teacher and friend of Achilles, is described as blond by Dion of Prusa.
- Heracles is described as strongly built and of curly blond hair, among others, by Apollonius of Rhodes in *Argonautica*.
- Achilles, considered the greatest warrior of the past, present and future, is described as blond by Homer in the *Iliad* when he is about to attack Agamemnon and, to avoid it, the goddess Athena retains him “and seized the son of Peleus by his yellow hair” (I:197).
- The Greek hero Ajax (Aias in the *Iliad*) is described as blond.
- Hector, the Trojan hero,²⁶ is described as swarthy in the *Iliad*.
- Odysseus, king of Ithaca, Achaean hero at Troy and protagonist of Homer’s *Odyssey*, is generally considered as swarthy. However, this can be tempered. Although he is described as white skinned and “dark bearded” in *The Odyssey*, his hair *ishyakinthos*, i.e., color of hyacinths. Traditionally this color was translated as “brown” but it was also said that the hyacinths grown in Greece were of a red variety. If true, that would make Odysseus red-haired.
- Odysseus in any case differs from the Greek hero prototype: tall, slender and blond. It was described as lower than Agamemnon but with broader shoulders and chest “like a ram” according to Priam, king of Troy. This could more likely be a physical type of a Red Nordid ²⁷ than a typical white Nordid Greek hero. It should also be mentioned that

²⁶ “Trojan”—i.e., a non-Greek. (Note of the Ed.)

²⁷ An explanation of terms like “red Nordid,” “slightly Armenized,” etc., appears in other articles of the website *Evropa Soberana*. (Note of the Ed.)

Homer used so frequently to call “blonds” his heroes that, in two lapses, he described Odysseus’ hair as *xanthos* in *The Odyssey*.

- Laertes, the father of Odysseus, was blond according to Homer’s *Odyssey*.
- Penelope, Odysseus’ wife, and queen of Ithaca, was blonde in Homer’s *Odyssey*.
- Telemachus, son of Odysseus and Penelope, was blond in Homer’s *Odyssey*.
- Briseis, the favorite slave in the harem of Achilles—captured in one of his raids, and treated like a queen in golden captivity—was “golden haired.”
- Agamede, daughter of Augeas and wife of Mulius, was “the blonde Agamede” according to Homer (*Iliad*, XI: 740).
- In his *Argonautica* Apollonius of Rhodes describes Jason and all the Argonauts as blond. The Argonauts were a *männerbund*: a confederation of warriors which gathered early Greek heroes, many direct children of the gods who laid the foundations of the legends and fathered the later heroes, often with divine mediation. They took their name from Argos, the ship they were traveling and did their Viking-style landings.

Below I reproduce some passages of Nordic phenotypes in Greek literature. Note that these are only a few examples of what exists in all of Greek literature:

- “Blonder hairs than a torch” (Sappho of Lesbos, talking about her daughter in Book V of her Alexandrian compilation).
- “Galatea of golden hair” (Philoxenus of Cythera, *The Cyclops* or *Galatea*).
- “...with a hair of gold and a silver face” (Alcman of Sparta, praising a maiden during a car race).
- “...happy girl of golden curls” (Alcman of Sparta, in honor of a Spartan poetess).
- “...blonde Lacedaemonians... of golden hair” (Bacchylides, talking about the young Spartans).
- Dicaearchus described Theban women as “blonde.”

The German scholar Wilhelm Sieglin (1855-1935) collected all the passages of Greek mythology which referred to the appearance of gods and heroes. From among the gods and goddesses, 60 were blond and 35 swarthy-skinned. Of the latter, 29 were chthonic-telluric divinities; marine deities such as Poseidon, or deities from the underworld. All of these came from the ancient pre-Aryan mythology of Greece. Of the mythological heroes, 140 were blond and 8 swarthy.

In this article, we have seen many instances of mythological characters, which is important because it provides us valuable information about the ideal of divinity and perfection of the ancient Greeks and points out that their values were identified with the North and the “Nordic” racial type. However, Sieglin also took into account the passages describing the appearance of real historical characters. Thus, of 122 prominent people of ancient Greece whose appearance is described in the texts, 109 were light haired (blond or red), and 13 swarthy.

“El rostro de la Europa clásica (I) —¿eran los griegos rubios y de ojos azules?” in *Europa Soberana*, May 3, 2013.

White nationalists' amnesty to non-whites - II

“White Nationalism in the USA is bogus because it refuses to acknowledge that the penultimate standard for whiteness is the Nordic type. Period.”

—Vikingbitch

The face of classical Europe (II): Were the Romans blond and blue-eyed?

The Latin *malus* [“bad”] (beside which I place *mélas*, Greek for “black”) might designate the common man as dark, especially black-haired (*hic niger est*), as the pre-Aryan settler of the Italian soil, notably distinguished from the new blond conqueror race by his color.

—Nietzsche, *Genealogy of Morals*

The Roman case is virtually identical to the Greek case. In the first minutes of the series *Rome*, a fighting between Gauls and Romans is recreated. The series had tremendous blunders, great nonsense, and several lies and BS in abundance. But the atmosphere was curious, as was the march of historical events, the legions in action, the splendor of the imperial palaces, the goings-on in the alleys of Rome, etc. One of the protagonists of the series was a centurion.

He was blond.

But how can you be so fascists so Nordicists, so Nazis so anti-Teresa-de-Calcutta, as Eurocentric and racists as these media? If you had a minimum of culture (like me) you should know that the Romans were of Mediterranean phenotype (like me)—and so on.

Things like these I have heard more times than you can imagine. And similar poppycock we continue to hear even by people who, by their admiration of Rome, obviously have read something written by these sober and tough soldiers who were the Romans, right?

In this article the testimonies from the handwriting of the real Romans are presented. Forget the movies and the illiterate pundits and let the sources explain us how Romans saw themselves.

The first Roman emperors as an example of patrician racial types

We will examine the phenotype of the first Roman emperors, who were representative of the race of patricians, the Roman *nobilitas*, i.e., the ruling aristocracy. What interests me is

not so much to demonstrate the presence of Nordic blood in the upper Roman class (which is easy), but mainly to show that the Nordic blood in Rome was also inextricably linked to the notion of divinity and of noble descent. Some passages are originally in Greek. This is because Greek had great prestige as a cultured, poetic and philosophical language, and there were many Romans educated in that language.

- Augustus, the first Roman emperor, was “blond” (*subflavum*) according to Suetonius (*De Vita Caesarum: Divus Augustus*), and had “blue eyes” (*glaucoi*) according to Pliny (*Naturalis Historia*, XI, CXLIII):

He had clear, bright eyes, in which he liked to have it thought that there was a kind of divine power, and it greatly pleased him, whenever he looked keenly at anyone, if he let his face fall as if before the radiance of the sun (Suetonius, *De Vita Caesarum: Divus Augustus*, LXXIX).

- Tiberius had “gray-blue” (*caesi*) eyes according to Pliny (*Naturalis Historia*, XI, CXLII).
- Caligula had a “blonde beard” (*aurea barba*) according to Suetonius (*De Vita Caesarum: Caligula*, LII).
- Claudio had “gray-white hair” (*canitieque*) according to Suetonius (*De Vita Caesarum: Divus Claudius*, XXX), and “gray eyes” (γλαυκόφθαλμος) according to Ioannes Malelas (*Chronographia*, X, CCXLVI).
- Nero was “blond or redhead” (*subflavum*); had “gray-blue eyes” (*caesi*) according to Suetonius (*De Vita Caesarum: Nero*, LI), and descended from a family named after their light pigmentation.

Of the Domitian family two branches have acquired distinction, the Calvini and the Ahenobarbi. The latter have as the founder of their race and the origin of their surname Lucius Domitius, to whom, as he was returning from the country, there once appeared twin youths of more than mortal majesty, so it is said, and bade him carry to the senate and people the news of a victory, which was as yet unknown. And as a token of their divinity it is said that they stroked his cheeks and turned his black beard to a ruddy hue, like that of bronze. This sign was perpetuated in his descendants, a great part of whom had red beards. (Suetonius, *De Vita Caesarum: Nero*, I.)

- Galba had gray-white (μυξοπόλιος) hair according to Malelas (*Chronographia*, X, CCLVIII) and blue eyes (*caerulei*) according to Suetonius (*De Vita Caesarum: Galba*, XXI).
- Vitellius was “redhead” (πυρρόακης) and had “gray” or “blue” eyes (γλαυκός) according to Malelas (*Chronographia*, X, CCLIX).

- Vespasian had “gray-white hair” (πολιός) and “wine-colored eyes” (οινοπαῆς τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς), although it is unclear whether this refers to red wine (brown) or white wine (green) according to Malelas (*Chronographia*, X, CCLIX).
- Titus, according to Sieglin (*Die blonden Haare der indogermanischen Völker des Altertums*, 109), was “blonde.”
- Domitian was “blond” (ξανθός) and had “gray or blue eyes” (γλαυκός) according to Malelas (*Chronographia*, X, CCLXII).
- Nerva was “gray-haired” according to John V. Day (*Indo-European Origins*).
- Trajan had “golden hair” (*caesaries*) according to Sieglin (*Die blonden Haare der indogermanischen Völker des Altertums*, 109). But let us not forget that Trajan was not Roman but a Spanish with Celtic blood, and therefore we should not take this into account when trying to define the phenotype of the Roman patrician aristocracy.
- Adriano, from a noble Roman family established in Hispania, was “dark-haired” (κυανοχαίτα) according to Sieglin (*Die blonden Haare der indogermanischen Völker des Altertums*, 112), and of “gray or blue eyes” (γλαυκὸφθαλμος) according to Malelas (*Chronographia* XI, CCLXXVII).

Interestingly, despite being described as “dark-haired,” on his statue there are traces of gold paint on his hair and beard. Formerly, the statues were painted according to the colors of the original “model.” His facial features correspond to the Nordic type.

- Antoninus Pius had “gray-white hair” (πολιός) and eyes “the color of wine” (οινοπαῆς τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς) according to Malelas (*Chronographia*, XI, CCLXXX).
- Lucius Verus had “blond hair” (*flaventium*) according to Sieglin (*Die blonden Haare der indogermanischen Völker des Altertums*, 110).
- Commodus had “blond hair” (οὐλόξανθος) and “blue or gray eyes” (υπόγλαυκος) according to Malelas (*Chronographia*, XII, CCLXXXIII).

Therefore, we find that:

- Of the 18 emperors from Augustus to Commodus, 9 had blond or red hair, 5 had gray or white hair, of 3 we have no way of knowing the hair color, and only one (Adriano) was described as dark-haired.

- Of the 18 emperors from Augustus to Commodus, 9 had blue or gray eyes, 2 had eyes of “the color of wine” (whatever that means, let us take it as brown), and of 7 we have no record as to the color of their eyes.

Many emperors came to power in their advanced years, with already gray or white hair. However, many were even so described with light eyes. If we had records of their appearance when they were young, it is likely that a significant proportion of them had light hair. Of the 9 Emperors with light hair, we know that at least 5 had clear eyes, and of the other 4 we know nothing about the color of their eyes. Of Tiberius, for example, we know nothing about his hair, maybe because he was bald when he came to power. And the same applies to Otto, who shaved his head and wore a wig. Nor do we know anything about the physical aspect of the “philosopher emperor” Marcus Aurelius, father of Commodus and a first-class sovereign. Many other emperors (as Julius Caesar), without being blond, were tall and had a very fair complexion, ruddy, or rosy.

From Commodus on I renounce to provide more emperor descriptions because:

1 – those individuals who began ascending to power were not of Roman origin, and therefore their phenotype cannot tell us anything about the genetic legacy of the *nobilitas* of Italian and patrician origin.

2 – miscegenation was already quite advanced; lineages of patrician origin having lost their meaning. At that time it was common that women of Roman high society should shave the manes of Germanic slaves to fix their blond-hair wigs.

The gods, the Italics, the patricians and the origins of Rome

Let us go back around 1200 BCE and transport ourselves to Italy. At that time, Central Europe was a buzzing propagating zone for the Indo-European stock. From what is now Germany, of a semi-barbarous proto-civilization of the iron age, flowed migrant groups in all directions. These waves were of the Celts, the Hellenes, the Illyrians and the Italics (also called *italios* or *italiotas*). At that time, the Italics, probably with some confederate Illyrian groups as in the case of the Dorians, broke into Italy.

They were a people who, in contrast to the native inhabitants of Italy, were patriarchal rather than matriarchal; ruddy rather than swarthy; cremated their dead instead of burying them, and brought with them a whole pantheon of gods and heroic warriors; spoke an Indo-European language, yielded a war cult and their symbology was fairly more oriented to heavenly than earthly symbols.

Italics were the settlers of sites such as the Villanovan Culture. Subsequent “civilian” conflicts that feminist history has termed as “matriarchy vs. patriarchy,” and what is left in

mythology regarding the heroic struggle of the Indo-Europeans against the native, telluric bodies (like snakes) actually refer to a spiritual confrontation triggered by the arrival of a small, aggressive and martial people that did not mix with the native population and struggled to dominate the area.

Under a rigid religious ritualism, on April 21, 753 BCE the heads of some Italic clans founded the city of Rome. For two centuries, Rome lived under the despotism and tyranny of the Etruscan kings, heads of a degenerate civilization that practiced sacrificial rituals, orgies, matriarchy, homosexuality, luxurious opulence, pedophilia, decadent entertainments, etc. The Etruscans came from Asia Minor, styling themselves as *rasena* (“chosen,” as the Jews) yet their legacy, which only represented the decline of something greater than themselves, meant that they were a doomed people.

The situation of the Roman tribute to Etruria lasted until, in 509 BCE, the Romans rose against the Etruscans and expelled the Etruscan king, Tarquinius Superbus, from the lands. Legends want to portray that this Italic insurrection—a “holy rebellion” against the pre-Indo-European; of patriarchy against matriarchy—was motivated by the rape of Lucretia, a beautiful and virtuous woman of Roman family at the hands of Sextus Tarquinius, son of the Etruscan king and raunchy as all his people, as opposed to the Puritanical morality of the Latins.

Lucretia committed suicide by honor and, this being the straw that broke the camel of the Roman patience, the patriarchs began a rebellion against the Etruscans that led to the overthrowing of the Etruscan kings, the founding of the Roman Republic and the systematic eradication of almost all Etruscan memory. (Comparable only to the “genocide” and the complete destruction of Carthage, the mortal enemy of Rome, considered as the reincarnation of Etruscan and oriental spirit, whose fields were cast in salt so that nothing would grow there.)

With the expulsion of the Etruscan power two praetors (later consuls) who held the vacuum of power were named. It was therefore founded the Roman Republic, marked by social struggles between patricians (nobles) and plebeians.

At that time, the original *Populus Romanus* was divided into 30 *curiae* (tribes or clans), whose origin was lost among the Italic peoples before the invasion. The *curiae* were headed by *patres* (parents) of the *gens* (family), that is, the founding fathers of the clan and of each family that composed it. Each *gens* or family was considered descendant of a genius or semi-divine patriarch, who was worshiped on the household as protector idol of the house and their descendants.

If we assimilate the fact that to the Romans a *gens* or family was a whole social, state, military and religious institution, we may understand the importance of the geniuses and *patres* as leaders of this small imperial cell, that corresponded to social, political and

military leadership as well as leading positions in the characteristic Roman religious worship, where Jupiter is confused with the State, the patriarch, the Senate, the Legion and the family. No wonder, then, that they were regarded as semi-divine and of very high wisdom.



Recreation of Rome during the Republic. Pay attention to the shape of the boats, so reminiscent of the Scandinavian *drakkar*.

The *patres* were those who gave their name to the breed of the patricians, namely those belonging to the system of families and clans: the aristocracy, the first *nobilitas*, which differed from the plebs or plebeians—the people outside the Italic clans. At first, the male patricians were the only Roman citizens, the members of the Legion: the only ones who could be senators and enjoyed all the rights and duties traditionally associated with Roman citizenship.

Later, after the “universalization” and “cosmopolitanization” of Rome during the Empire, the patricians came to form an aristocracy over the other peoples of Italy, encompassed by the plebs. The patricians as social class, and among them the *patres* as heads of households, are probably the most exalted expression of patriarchy and patriotism itself of the Indo-European, in opposition to the narcotic matriarchy of the pre-Indo-European peoples of Europe, already decadents and altogether “civilized.”

We now turn to the patricians and Roman gods from the point of view of the phenotype, after seeing the first Roman emperors, mostly patrician.

- Lucius Cornelius Sulla (138-78 BCE), Roman consul and dictator, of patrician descent, had blond hair, blue eyes and a ruddy complexion:

...for his golden head of hair gave him a singular appearance, and as for bravery, he was not ashamed to testify in his own behalf, after such great and noble deeds as he had performed. So much, then, regarding his attitude towards the divine powers. (Plutarch, *De Vita: Sulla*.)

What was the rest of his figure appears in his statues, but that fierce and unpleasant look of his blue eyes was still more terrible to stare at because the color of his face, being noted at intervals so ruddy and red mixed with his whiteness, and it is even said that he took his name from that, coming to be a nickname for the designated color. Thus, a teller of Athens taunted him with these lines: “If you knead a blackberry with flour, you have the portrait of Sulla.”

Marcus Porcius Cato the “Censor,” better known as Cato the Elder (234-149 BCE), the pronouncer of the famous saying *Ceterum censeo Carthaginem esse delendam* (“Furthermore, I think Carthage must be destroyed”) in every speech, had reddish hair according to Plutarch:

As for his outward appearance, he had reddish hair, and keen grey eyes, as the author of the well-known epigram ill-naturedly gives us to understand: “Red-haired, snapper and biter, his grey eyes flashing defiance, Porcius, come to the shades, back will be thrust by their Queen.” (Plutarch, *Cato the Elder*.)

- Poppaea Sabina (30-65 CE), the wife of Nero, famous for her beauty all over Rome, was very white and redhead.

We note that the Romans, like the Greeks, saw light pigmentation as a sign of the “divine” or “supernatural.” Some may interpret this that light pigmentation was rare among the Romans. But considering naming conventions, it is clear that the light features were quite common among the patricians. According to Karl Earlson:

Once they had reached a certain stage in their lives, the patricians earned their additional name (*cognomina*), which was often based on their physical appearance. The name Albus indicated light skin; Ravilla, gray eyes; Caesar, blue eyes; Flavius, blonde hair; Rufus, red hair; Longus, tall; Macer, a slender constitution. All these names were common among the patricians.

Thus, the Latin author Quintilian, in *Institutio Oratoria* (I, IV, XXV), notes that a man named Rufus or Longo has that name for his body characteristics: he is high or redhead. Plutarch (*Coriolanus* XI) states that two men, one redhead and one swarthy, could be distinguished because the first would be called Rufus and the second Niger. Aelius Spartianus, in *Historia Augusta* (II, IV), suggests that the Caesars earned their name from the fact that the founder of his *gens* had blue eyes (*oculis caesiis*). The lexicographer Sextus Pompeius Festus, in *De verborum significatu* (CCCLXXVI ff) states that the name Ravilia

derives from “gray eyes” (*ravis oculis*), and the name Caesulla from blue eyes (*oculis caesiis*). Julius Paris, in *De nominibus Epitome*, VII, provides examples of names of women that, he says, have their origin in the pigmentation of those who held them: Rutila (red hair), Caesellia (blue eyes), Rodacilla (pink complexion), Murrula and Burra (red hair or ruddy complexion).

I have provided all these quotations to show that these names were not purely arbitrary but were, in fact, based on physical characteristics; and that these features were not uncommon among certain strata of Roman society.

Even where the patricians had almost disappeared, the Romans had memories of the old *patres* as the semi-divine beings who arrived to Italy, founded Rome, “Romanized” the peninsula and bequeathed the patriarchy to those lands, together with a strong mentality and a durable and effective political system that lasted for centuries. The ancient ancestors of the patricians were still considered in Rome as a common heritage to be proud of.

Karl Earlson summarizes how he follows Wilhelm Sieglin’s findings as to the pigmentation of the patricians and their identity as a breed:

Wilhelm Sieglin [in *Die blonden Haare der indogermanischen Völker des Altertums*, 1935] compiled the list of the Roman patricians whose names indicate light hair. He provided the following list: 7 Flavi, 20 Flaviani, 10 Fulvi, 121 Fulvii, 27 Rubrii, 26 Rufi, 24 Rufii, 36 Rufini, 45 Rutilii and 13 Ahenobarbi. This completely disrupts Sergi’s claim that: “The Romans also had their Flavi, indicating that people with fair complexion were rare and required a special name, but does not indicate that the Germanic type was considered aristocratic or dominant” (Sergi: 1901, 20). In fact, such people were not scarce.

Sieglin also determined that among the families Iulii, Licinii, Lucretii, Sergii and Virgini, the name Flavius was very common; Rufi was often seen among the families Antonii, Caecilii, Coelii, Cornelii, Geminii, Iunii, Licinii families (often also the Flavii), Minucii, Octavii, Pinarii, Pompei, Rutilii, Sempronii, Trebonii, Valgii and Vibii; Rufini was common among the *gens* Antonia, Cornelia, Iunia, Licinian, Trebonia and Vibia. Sieglin notes that this list could certainly be increased in the light of further research.

Besides all this, Sieglin also compiled a list of 63 blond or red-haired Romans. Many of these individuals were patricians. He also found references to 27 blond divinities (including Jupiter, Venus, Mercury, Diana, etc.) and 10 blondes in heroic personalities.

Man makes the gods in their own image. These blond gods speak of the racial nature of the early Romans. (In the *Aeneid* Virgil refers to Mercury, Lavinia, Turnus and Camilla as “golden-haired.”) His list of blonds includes Aeneas, the mythical ancestor of the Latins (also blond was his son Iulo or Ascanius), Romulus and Remus, the twin founders of

Rome; Augustus, the first Roman emperor, and even Roma: which symbolized the city of Rome.

While most of Sieglin's historical figures of light hair were patricians, most of the 17 swarthy Romans in his references were commoners or freedmen.

On the disappearance of the patricians and the mestizization of the original Romans

What happened to the patricians? They faded with time. In the numerous conspiracies and intrigues of the Empire, it was common that after the formation of two opposing parties and the victory of one over the other, the winner assassinated the head of the enemy party, his family and all the families related to him. (The strong destroy each other and the weak continue to live, George Bernard Shaw said.) These calamities greatly decimated the patrician class. If we add the ongoing miscegenation in the majority of plebeian population, the immigration of slaves from Syria and the provinces of Asia Minor, Egypt and Africa, as well as the bleeding of the patrician stock over the battlefield, we realize why the patricians did not last too long during the Empire, given the dysgenic situation. John V. Day wrote:

In a journal about the West and its future, it is fitting to end this article by briefly recounting the fate of the Roman upper class. Among Indo-European peoples, the Romans offer an especially useful example because they left masses of records, enabling later historians to determine what became of them. The evidence found in ancient texts implies that this class descended largely from Indo-Europeans who had a decidedly northern European physical type, *although that isn't something one reads in modern books about Roman history* [emphasis added]. In Rome, though, the upper class was always a tiny minority. Instead of protecting its interests, it allowed itself to wither away. Consider a bleak statistic. We know of about fifty patrician clans in the fifth century B.C., but by the time of Caesar, in the later first century B.C., only fourteen of these had survived. The decay continued in imperial times. We know of the families of nearly four hundred Roman senators in A.D. sixty five, but, just one generation later, all trace of half of these families had vanished.

If we in the West want to avoid a similar fate, we must learn from Indo-European history.²⁸

In the time of Julius Caesar we know 45 patricians, of which only one is represented by posterity when Hadrian rises to power. The Aemilii, Fabii, Claudii. Manlii, Valerii and everyone else, except the Comelii have disappeared. Augustus and Claudius ascended 25 families to the Patriciate, and by the reign of Nerva all but 6 have disappeared. Of the

²⁸ John V. Day, Ph.D., is the author of *Indo-European Origins: The Anthropological Evidence* (The Institute for the Study of Man, 2001).

families of nearly 400 senators registered under Nero in 65 CE, trace has been lost about half of them in times of Nerva. And the records are so complete that it can be assumed that these statistics represent quite accurately the disappearance of the male lineage of the families concerned.²⁹

Conclusion

Were the Romans, then, blond?

It all depends on what you mean by “Romans.” The original Romans did not descend from the original inhabitants of the Italian soil, but of the Italics (*italios* or *italiotes* or as you please to call them) and probably also of Illyrian groups, namely, Indo-European invaders who entered Italy from the North, what is now southern Germany. These early invaders—from whom the Latins descended (considered the most influential and who eventually gave their language to the Empire), the Sabines (considered by Plutarch “a colony of the Lacedaemonians,” i.e., Spartans), the Umbrians, Samnites and all patrician clans that founded Rome and the Republic—were indeed mostly Nordic, and also formed the basis of the political and military elite of the Empire.

However, in the later Rome these groups formed an aristocratic minority ruling over a mob of pre-Indo-European origin and, later, even Semites and black slaves. This ended up in interbreeding between all these groups. Over time, the numbers of the dominant Nordic caste withered, and with them their strong patriarchal, sober and authoritative influence in favor of the dissolution of the Empire expressed in its cosmopolitanism, multiculturalism and proliferation of slaves.

The rest of the history of the post-Roman imperial splendor and their great men, we already know. It is set in a decadent agony, punctuated by binges, parties, orgies, wine snobbery, false sophistication, acrobats, gays, stupid fads, obesity, blond wigs made from hair stolen from Germanics, mongrels, pacifists, emboldened slaves, “liberated” women, Christian zealots and a corrupt bourgeois which reneged of their homeland.

The ghost of ancient Etruria, killed by the ancient Latin Patriarchs, had reborn. Before these decaying monsters, which had nothing to do with the demigod patricians or their rude peasants and patriotic soldiers, the Germanic “barbarian” was really an authentic, pure, hard, strong, noble, idealistic, simple and brave hero, in whose blood awaited the hidden forces of the Indo-European humanity, ready to give birth and germinate in the next millennia of European power.

²⁹ Cf. Tenney Frank, “Race Mixture in the Roman Empire,” *American Historical Review*, Vol. XI, 1916.

In short, it has not been argued that all Romans were of Nordic type. It has been argued that the Nordic blood prevailed among the Italic invaders, the ancestors of the posterior dominant Roman aristocracy, the authentic Roman citizens, who imposed their ethos throughout the Empire and spread their spirit, marking the “Roman style” with a distinctly Nordic stamp.

“Are the Germanics a healthy and natural people that will overcome the decadence of the Romans?” — Tacitus, Germania.

“El rostro de la Europa clásica (II) —¿eran los romanos rubios y de ojos azules?” in *Europa Soberana*, May 4, 2013.

From the editor's desk

Italian mudbloods

The 1924 US immigration Act was aimed at restricting the Southern and Eastern Europeans, among them Jews who had migrated in large numbers since the 1890s, as well as prohibiting the immigration of Middle Easterners, East Asians, and people from India. Thanks to it, the quotas for immigration from Southern Europe were so restrictive that there were more Italians, Greeks, Hungarians, Portuguese, Romanians, Spaniards, Chinese, and Japanese that left the United States than those who arrived as immigrants. Alas, the deranged altruists cannot control their ethno-suicidal impulses. A good example of this is precisely how the Italian mafia infected a previously Nordish, genuinely white nation.

Last year I re-watched a few scenes from the *Godfather* films and *Goodfellas*. Tommy DeVito (interpreted by Joe Pesci in *Goodfellas*), inspired in a mafia fellow of the real American world, is one of the most repulsive characters I have ever seen on the big screen. Presently I can no longer tolerate watching the whole film. I find that Italian subculture nauseating. That's why, at the beginning of the second *Godfather* film, Senator Geary's words (after he attended the First Communion celebration of the son of Michael Corleone) are my favorite line of all mafia films I've ever seen.

After the ceremony in the luxurious mansion Senator Geary meets with Michael, the head of the Corleone crime family, in his office. The Corleone family had obtained control of several casinos in Nevada. Geary offers to help Michael obtain a disputed gaming license in exchange for an exorbitant bribe, and this is how he addresses Michael in front of his private gang:

Because I intend to squeeze you. I don't like your kind of people. I don't like to see you come out to this clean country [I remember how I loved these very words while watching the film in the middle 1970s] with your oily hair, dressed up in those silk suits, passing yourselves off as decent Americans. I'll do business with you, but the fact is that I despise your masquerade, the dishonest way you pose yourself. Yourself and your whole fucking family.

Let us now visualize in our mind how, in the first *Godfather*—that according to Stanley Kubrick included the best cast in cinematic history—Vito Corleone, before the heads of the Five Families, opposes the heroin business and pleads for safety when his son Michael returns home from Sicily.

Watch that scene on your TV or computer screen...

This visual experiment is addressed to those who call a spade a spade. You need to be dishonest with yourself to tag as “Aryans” those mafia bosses sitting around the table. Unfortunately, quite a few white nationalists, still under the grip of egalitarianism, see “whites” where more sincere racialsists see mudbloods.

The following article is an exchange between Vance Stubbs and an anti-Nordicist white nationalist.

Stubbs responds

I'm using Aryan and White as synonyms, and using the taxonomic definition of a subspecies as my definition of race. So yes, Aryans are a race, unless we want to bump them up to a species. We're far more physiologically distinct than the other primate subspecies. That's sufficient proof to me.

Some writers use "race" to refer to an extended ethnicity, like the "Germanic race" or the "Chinese race." I don't use it in such a fashion, I'd refer to populations of that size as sub-races, ethnicities, or national blocs. Likewise I don't refer to humans as a race, though it isn't grammatically wrong per se.

"Nordic" is trickier to define. In some racial theories it refers to a specific phenotype contrasted with, say, the Alpine. That isn't my concern.

In practical terms, "Nordicism" has come to refer the recognition that some parts of Europe have undergone significantly more mongrelization than others. *Stormfront* logic. Turks are bad swarthy sand-niggers but if you point out that the Europeans who've bordered Turkey for a thousand years have more Turkish admixture than the Danish do the waterworks begin.

Ideologically, this shit is the thin side of the wedge. Just ask Jefferson. Anti-"Nordicists" are three beers away from giving speeches to Natural Conservatives about how "America is a culture of opportunity." Either you pretend people are "equal" to avoid "division" or you don't.

The Greeks have been pretty cool lately, and as a class I consider them White Europeans, but the average ethnic Greek simply is not as purely White as the average ethnic Dane. Racists who for some reason can't emotionally handle that fact have no future.

Joe Smith commented:

Turks are not "sand-niggers." Some of the ones in Europe are because they are what the Turkish government unloads from Anatolia, which is far more Arab influenced than

Western Turkey. Many Western Turks live in America and are generally white peoples racially, albeit Eastern culturally.

Vance Stubbs responded:

That doesn't matter though. Greeks are more Turkish than Danes. Turks are more Arab than Greeks. Greeks are more Arab than Danes, by extension. Those are just the facts on the ground.

"Significance" is vague, if someone claims Obama isn't "significantly" Negroid all I can do in refutation is put it in more concrete terms. Factually, Obama is more Negroid than Craig Cobb (lol) and Greeks are more Semitic than Danes. Once you know the facts then you can assign significance to them, but "anti-Nordicists" just make emotional non-sequitur defenses until the facts are swept back under the rug.

Joe Smith said:

Imagine if I started spewing venom towards you or calling you a mongrel or claiming the history of the Vikings or Gustav Adolphus for myself because some Scandinavians like Bjork look like fucking Gooks.

Vance Stubbs responded:

Claiming that Scandinavians are more heavily mongrelized than Greeks would in some ways be preferable. Pretty doubtful in my opinion, but at least you'd be out of the equalizing quagmire.

I mean what's the positive claim of the anti-Nordicists? That every member of every European ethnicity is completely free of non-White admixture? That non-White admixture exists among Europeans but is for some reason distributed with perfect equality among each ethnicity, regardless of geographic location? That non-White admixture isn't a valid topic of discussion for White Nationalists, or isn't—all else being equal—a genetic flaw for a citizen of a White State?

They can't seriously claim any of those things. So they try to change the subject to the Swedes being deranged or the Golden Dawn being politically courageous. But that only works on internet forums; when your ideological enemies control every university, television studio, and newspaper you can't just dodge tough questions about your position. You need to be unflinching even if it means stepping on toes (or at least the radical ideologues need to be).

Joe Smith said:

Turkey is not an Arab country, it is first an artificial ethnicity invented by Ataturk. Turks can be genetically European, mongoloid, or Arab, or a combination of all of these. Regardless, your train of thought is incredibly simplistic.

Technically, most Europeans have some middle eastern or Levant ancestry. Look up something called the Neolithic revolution and the cultures they left in Southern Europe, but also through Germany, Russia and yes even Scandinavia. Of course these peoples were not Arabs, but they came from the middle east.

Vance Stubbs responded:

You're still begging the question. Does every European ethnicity have the same amount of non-White admixture? Or is trace mongrelization in some more severe than in others?

If the average Dane is 0.2% non-White and the average Greek is 0.4% non-White³⁰ then the Danish are more racially pure than the Greeks. This is exactly what you'd expect from looking at their physical location on a map. Why do so-called racists react to this sort of statement like liberals react to Black IQ stats?

I mean hell, have you ever heard a Swede claim that Swedish men are just as tough and masculine as Russian men? And when challenged start mocking the Russians for being poor and posting pictures of Russian transvestites? I haven't, which is good because it would be stupid.

Joe Smith said:

Is the West really in a position to be bickering over this shit? Pretty much the goal of European nationalists is to make a Europe of the nations, i.e., Denmark for the Danes, Greek for the Greeks, etc., and we realize that as a historically connected peoples we have to work together. That is how I interpret white nationalism.

Vance Stubbs responded:

³⁰ This is a rather polite way of discussing with a vehement anti-Nordicist. Modern Greeks are a lot more mixed than that. (Note of the Ed.)

Actually, I do believe now is the best time to resolve this kind of thing. It's a significant ideological vulnerability, and if we don't identify it early our enemies will exploit it once resources have been committed.

They will press the issue. If they receive an answer which is inconsistent with the rest of our racial doctrine they will systematically pick it apart in every classroom and on every television. The Left has tried to avoid an ideological confrontation so far, as it's safer for them to stick with suppression, but if the wind turns they'll analyze every detail.

In the long run being honest about your faults helps mitigate the ability of others to use them against you (or at least that's my theory). I don't want the Greeks to think that they suck or that they aren't Europeans. I want them to be shrewd enough to avoid getting burned in the future and I want White racialists to be free from some sort of "Greek question" hanging over their head.

While a systematic ideological position on marginal cases is necessary even for, say, White Americans, examining nations on the edges of Europe (or wherever trace admixture is most prevalent, if you don't believe it to be the edge) makes the need clearer.

Vanguard News Network forum (March 2014).

Editor's note:

After Vance Stubbs read the above passage of the first draft of this book he commented:

Two possible footnotes: I refer to "Natural Conservatives" in my piece. That's a joking reference to the Mexican immigrants the Republicans have been trying to court recently.

Also I said Obama was blacker than Craig Cobb, which was a tongue-in-cheek reference to a daytime talkshow recently claiming Cobb was "14% sub-Saharan." He might be gullible, but I highly doubt there was any truth to the claim.

AA approach to the one-drop rule

by Larry Mars

“Schweitzer’s niglets” is one of your most insightful texts up to now, César, thank you. Its timing was particularly appropriate now that black-run Detroit is trying—unsuccessfully—to go officially bankrupt so it can keep on rolling a debt worth many billions of dollars.

Significantly, the last article linked by you (“Detroit’s Downfall & Japan’s”) is by Mr. Parrott, a self-entitled “Christian” white nationalist. Like I have pointed out several times before on this blog, it is well beyond me to understand how such a thing is possible. “Hey, nigger, you’re my brother in Christ and all that stuff, but could you please take your damn pickaninnies and your damn she-monkey wife and leave my White society forever?”

As far as the discussion on miscegenation that began on this thread is concerned, my own view on the subject is as follows:

My father’s grandfather on his mother’s side was Black. Besides, one of my grandmother’s grandmother on my mother side was Indian. Needless to say, I’m neither white nor I see myself as one. But having at least two brain cells to rub together (to borrow Mr. Covington’s expression) I can see the net result of racial intermixing for what it is: the most tragic human experiment people could engage in. I challenge everybody who disagrees with this judgment to visit the most miscegenated and most Negro/Indian heavily-populated states in Brazil and try to live there as the natives do for at least a year and see if they can leave these places with the same views on race they had when they arrived.

These people are not real human beings. They are humanoids at best and simple animals at worst.

It’s not just that they are physically repulsive. It’s that their intelligence, their morals, their behavior as a whole is simply too different from what you expect from a minimally civilized White man. And it’s not a matter of education or income either. Give them good schools and they will destroy them; give them money and they will promptly squander it in an extravagant way or another.

Having in mind that miscegenation is a self-reinforcing phenomenon, the only way to prevent it is to take an Alcoholics Anonymous approach about it. The AA people attitude to alcohol, as everybody knows is “avoid the first drink.” The only way to stop having drinking problems is not to drink and the only way not to drink is not to drink at all, to completely abstain from drinking. That is to say, as far as preventing race mixing is concerned, the one-drop rule is the only rule that really works: only pure whites are Whites. If you open a single exception where the hell do you draw the line? If being white ceases to be a biological concept and becomes an honorary title (“I’m mostly white and I’m pro-white, so I deserve to be counted as White”) you’ll go down a very dangerous conceptual slippery slope with no clear benefits for the white nationalist movement and for the real white population by and large.

Tough and sad as it may sound coming from a self-defined non-white as I am, there should be no non-whites living in any future White Homeland. Zero.

The survival of the White race should be placed above all personal considerations and interests. Any other stand on the subject cannot be taken seriously.

I’m not naive. The overwhelming majority of whites are stupid assholes who don’t give a fuck to anything beyond their own petty personal interests and who consider white nationalism the summation of Evil itself. But Western civilization is rooted in the European gene pool and you cannot have the former without the latter. And if to preserve the latter you have to go to great lengths, including the cruelty of keeping out of a future White Homeland partially white people who are even smarter or more racially aware than most whites living there (people like me, for example), *then be it*.

Editor’s note

The above post in *The West’s Darkest Hour* of July 24, 2013 elicited almost a hundred comments. Like Mars I live in Latin America and can see every day that what he says is the purest truth here down the South. However, in my humble opinion people like Mars are worth a million of deracinated whites of this worst of all generations ever. I would not expel people like him in the first, revolutionary generation of the new ethnostate. Once the racial war is over it will be relatively easy for a mixed couple to adopt an orphaned pure white kid who lost his parents during the war. It is just that simple...

Are white nationalists real men?

Thus spake Zarathustra

“Why so hard!”—said to the diamond one day the charcoal; “are we then not near relatives?”—

Why so soft? O my brethren; thus do I ask you: are ye then not—my brethren?

Why so soft, so submissive and yielding? Why is there so much negation and abnegation in your hearts? Why is there so little fate in your looks?

And if ye will not be fates and inexorable ones, how can ye one day—conquer with me?

And if your hardness will not glance and cut and chip to pieces, how can ye one day—create with me?

For the creators are hard. And blessedness must it seem to you to press your hand upon millenniums as upon wax,—

—Blessedness to write upon the will of millenniums as upon brass,—harder than brass, nobler than brass. Entirely hard is only the noblest.

This new table, O my brethren, put I up over you: *Become hard!*

(*Thus spake Zarathustra*, Part III)

Rockwell, Pierce, Hitler

An article by Andrew Hamilton includes germane quotations that we reproduce apropos the lack of gravitas, severitas, and diamond-hardness among common whites and white nationalists.

George Lincoln Rockwell

The fundamental error of the right wing—that sweet reason will change the world and save us from the Jewish tyrants.

Reason is still an infant in human affairs, a precious and rare development found in the mutational brains of an infinitesimal minority of *Homo sapiens*. And even the few geniuses able to exercise genuine, independent reason are almost entirely incapable of acting in accordance with the dictates of that reason—which is one of the reasons so many of them end up as failures in a world which does not appreciate them or their reason.

It is *force, power, strength* which rules the world, from the ebb and flow of the tides to the decision of your neighbor to join the Rotary. Only a negligible fringe of oddball humans change their mind as a result of being convinced by a superior argument. The overwhelming masses, *including the mass of today's "intellectuals"* [emphasis Hamilton] change their minds only in order to *conform*. In other words, the minds of the vast majority *always* bow to the strongest opinion—the opinion which brings rewards and avoids punishment.

The right wing examines its reasons and arguments and facts and finds them true and good—as they may be. They then become outraged when the slobs next door cannot see and appreciate this rightness and, very probably, throw them out of the house for preaching “hate.” But this is only as things are. The slobs will hold whatever opinion seems to show the most strength and *will to power*. They are completely, hopelessly female in their approach to reason and always, *always* prefer strength to “rightness.”

William Pierce

Things are very bad indeed, but they are far from hopeless. Only a people or a nation that gives itself up for lost is truly and irrevocably lost. There is a bloody and terrible ordeal ahead of us, and many will perish—but our race can still be saved, and that, in the long run, is all that counts.

Do not be discouraged by the indifference of the people around you. Remember, the great mass of people have always been like that and always will be. When the Christians are ahead they cheer for the Christians, and when the lions are ahead they cheer for the lions. They have no understanding or concern for anything but the present and for what they see as directly affecting their comfort, welfare, or security.

But the masses do not make history. [In his article Hamilton explains: “The masses” includes academics, intellectuals, and high-IQ and socially successful people generally. It is not a class thing] That is and always has been the task of the few. Those few [see below] must embody in themselves a majority of will and determination. They must know what they want and be willing to do whatever is necessary to achieve their goal.

Today the old order of things is crumbling into ruin, and the world will never again be restored to what it was before. But a new order will eventually emerge from the wreckage of the old.

It is only too late to save the present order from final collapse. It is not too late to begin building the new.

[Hamilton comments: How many are “the few”? Here’s the assessment of a formidable achiever, also deceased, whose judgment on such matters cannot be taken lightly, much less dismissed out of hand:]

Adolf Hitler

In my view, when there are nine thousand men in a country who are capable of facing prison from loyalty to an idea, this idea remains a living one.

[Hamilton comments: Of course, the speaker was probably referring to an extraordinary level of commitment, on the order of an Anders Breivik or Timothy McVeigh. Even so, he added:]

And as long as a man [i.e., presumably *one man*] is left to carry the flag, nothing is lost. Faith moves mountains.

[Hamilton comments: Each of the three men just quoted was an optimist. They said so explicitly and their words and deeds bore them out. Yet each “failed.” I qualify “failed,” because in a larger spiritual sense (as far as white survival is concerned) they were all successes given the insurmountable odds they faced. Moreover, the battle in which they were engaged still rages. It is world-historical and spans generations. The outcome has yet to be determined.]

Excerpted from “Power and losing” in
Counter-Currents Publishing (December 6, 2013).

From the editor's desk

Together with the abridgment of Pierce's *Who We Are* the next article, the online book *Esparta y su Ley* translated from the Spanish blogsite *Europa Soberana*, are the longest in this book. We reproduce the translation of *Esparta y su Ley* here to show how spoiled and feminized Western men have become, including nationalists.

Sparta and its Law



Introduction. Sparta was the first massive reaction against the inevitable decline brought about by the comfort of civilization, and as such, there is much to learn from it in this age of biological degradation and a moral induced by a techno-industrial society. The Spartans really broke away from all vices produced by civilization, and so placed themselves at the top of the pyramid of power in their region. All current elite military traditions are somewhat heirs of what took place in Sparta, and this signals the survival of the Spartan mission.

In this book we have gathered data from various sources, giving priority to the classics. The historian and priest of the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, Plutarch (46-125 CE), in his work *Ancient Customs of the Spartans* and *Life of Lycurgus* gives us valuable information about Spartan life and Spartan laws, and much of what we know about Sparta we owe to him. Xenophon (430-334 BCE), historian and philosopher who sent his children to be educated in Sparta, is another good source of information, in its *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*. Plato (427-347 BCE), in his famous *Republic* shows us the concept of how a higher state should be ruled, listing many measures that seem directly taken from Sparta, because it was his inspiration.

Today our indoctrinating academics vaguely teach that Sparta was a militaristic and brutal state completely turned to power, whose system of education and training was very hard. We are introduced to the Spartans roughly as efficient soldiers, crude and mindless, which

“were only interested in war.” This is a deliberately distorted reflection of what they really were, and it is mainly because we have been taught by some decadent Athenians, spiced with the bad faith of those who currently manage the information, who seek to distort history to serve economic and other types of interests.

The Spartans left an indelible spiritual mark. The simple fact that even today the adjective “Spartan” designates qualities of hardness, severity, roughness, strength, stoicism and discipline, and that there are words that describe the attraction toward Sparta (laconophilia, philodorism), gives us an idea of the enormous role played by Sparta. It was much more than just a State: it was an archetype, the maximum exponent of the warrior doctrine. After the perfect façade brave men and athletic women hid the most religious, disciplined and ascetic of all people of Greece, who cultivated wisdom in a discrete and laconic way, far from the hustle and urban vulgarity which even then had appeared.

It is impossible to finish this introduction without reference to the movie *300*, even though most of the text was written well before the film came out in 2007. As you will be reading, you will see that the lifestyle of the historical Spartans had nothing to do with the characters that this film presents, which tries to make the Spartans more digestible to us, introducing them in a more Americanized, sympathetic way to modern minds, which is not too bad because otherwise the message may not have passed through. On a higher level, Sparta provides the perfect excuse to approach important issues.

Origins of Sparta. Before the great Indo-European invasions, Europe was populated by various pre-Indo-European peoples, some of whom had advanced societies, which we are inclined to consider as related to other civilizations and societies outside Europe.

At first, most of Greece was inhabited by Mediterranean peoples that later Hellenes invaders would call Pelasgians. Around 2700 BCE, the Minoan civilization flourished (named in memory of the legendary King Minos), based on the Mediterranean island of Crete, very influenced by Babylon and the Chaldeans, clearly related to the Etruscans and even with Egypt, and known for her telluric “bull worship,” the palace of Knossos, buildings stripped of fortifications and abundant art spirals, curves, snakes, women and fish, all of which places this civilization within the orbit of the cultures of telluric character, focused on Mother Earth or *Magna Mater*.

According to Greek mythology, as the first peripheral Hellenes were advancing in Greece and coming into contact with its people, the Minoans ended up demanding, as an annual tribute fourteen young, male Hellenes to be ritually slaughtered (the legend of Theseus, Ariadne, the labyrinth and the minotaur is reminiscent of this era).

By 2000 BCE there was an invasion by the first Hellenic wave that opened what in archeology is called the Bronze Age. The Hellenes were an Indo-European mass that, in

successive waves quite separated in time, invaded Greece from the north. They were tough people; more united, martial and vigorous than the Pelasgians, and ended up submitting those lands despite being numerically inferior to the native population. These Hellenes were the famous Achaean Greeks referred by Homer and the Egyptian inscriptions. They brought their gods, solar symbols (including the swastika, later used by Sparta), the chariots, the taste for the amber, fortified settlements, Indo-European language (Greek, who would end up imposing itself on the indigenous population), Nordic blood, patriarchy and hunter-warrior traditions.

The Achaeans settled in Greece, establishing themselves as the dominant caste, without at first reaching Crete. The first destruction of the Minoan palaces (around 1700 BCE) was probably due to a large earthquake of which there is evidence; not Achaean invasion.

The Achaeans, finally, opened the way for the Mycenaean civilization, centered on the city of Mycenae, Argolis. In 1400 BCE, the Achaeans took by force the island of Crete, destroying the palaces and finally ending, to some extent, the Minoan civilization; eventually adopting some of its outward forms—what many uprooted invaders who trample a superior, but already declining civilization, do. These Achaeans were the ones who, around 1260 BCE, besieged and razed Troy in a crusade of the West-East capable to unite all the Achaeans—generally prone to war between themselves—in a common enterprise. In the *Iliad* Homer describes them as a band of barbarians with mentality and appearance of Vikings sweeping the refined and civilized Troy. After this process, the entire western coast of Asia Minor, the Black Sea and the Bosphorus was subject to Greek influence: a process that will have a huge weight upon history.

Around 1200 BCE there was, again, a huge migration flow. Countless Indo-European peoples moved to the South in great tumult and to the East. The entire eastern Mediterranean suffered major seizures under the so-called “Sea Peoples” and other Indo-European tribes that invaded Turkey, Palestine, Egypt and the steppes of Eastern Europe, and opened the archaeological Iron Age in the Eastern Mediterranean.

As for the Mycenaean civilization of the Achaeans, it was also destroyed by one of these invasions. The apocalyptic references in the traditional Greek history (fire, destruction, death) made many historians mistakenly think in large earthquakes or riots. In this legendary invasion, much larger than the previous, iron weapons were used, superior than the bronze weapons of the Achaeans. The Dorians, belonging to such migration and ancestors of the Spartans, broke into Greece with extreme violence, destroying in their path cities, palaces and villages. The Dorians took Crete and the Mycenaean civilization of the Achaeans abruptly disappeared from the archaeological record. Argolis (on Mycenae ground) never forgot this, and although now with Dorian blood the state of Argos and its domains would stubbornly oppose the Spartan power in later centuries.

The former settlement of the Dorians had been in the Balkans and in Macedonia, where they lived in a barbarous or semi-barbarous state. They had not always lived in the area but ended up there as a result of another migration from further north. The most sensible thesis considers the place of origin of the Dorians along with the Celts, Italics, Illyrians and the remaining Greeks, the so-called Tumulus Culture and the latter Urnfield Cultures and Halstatt Culture: proto-Indo-European civilizations, tribal and semi-barbarous that flourished in Central Europe north of the Alps and southern Scandinavia. According to the Greek historian Herodotus, the Dorians had their primordial home “among the snows.” Genetically, Dorians seem to belong to *R1b* paternal lineage, that dominates Western Europe today.

Across Europe, after the invasions there was a contest (open first and then more subtle) between the martial mentality of the new invaders from the North and the native mentality of concupiscence. The East, Finland, Italy, the Iberian Peninsula and Greece were examples of this struggle, and usually the result was always the same: the Indo-European invaders prevailed despite their overwhelming numerical inferiority. Then they settled as nobility over a mob descendant of aboriginals and subjected peoples. In the Peloponnesus, this latent struggle resulted in the superhuman fruit of Sparta, just as, later, the struggle between Italic and Etruscan led to Rome.

Every era and every place has its own master race. At that time and place the Dorians were the dominant race. Of Nordic appearance, a soul of ice and fire, an inborn discipline and a brutal warrior vocation so natural to them distinguished them from the more peaceful natives, fully dedicated to the pleasures of the lower abdomen. The Dorians in particular (and among them specifically the Spartans, who kept themselves strictly separated from the rest of the people) maintained their original features longer than the other Hellenes: centuries after the Dorian invasion blond hair and tall stature were still considered the characteristic of the Spartan. This is because, as in India, the great epic of ancient invasion remained for a long time in the collective memory of the people; and the racism of the Dorians, along with their insistence on remaining a selected elite, led to a system of racial separation which preserved for centuries the characteristics of the original invaders.

The name of the Dorians comes from Dorus, son of the legendary Helen (Helen of Troy was before Helen of Sparta). The aristocrats were called Heracleidae, as claimed descent also from Heracles, thus attributing divine ancestry. Divided into three tribes, the Dorians were led by the royal lineage, as well as oracles and Hellenic priests equivalent to the Celtic Druids. For the Heracleidae, the invasion of Greece was a divine command nominally from Apollo “the Hyperborean,” their favorite god.

During the four centuries, from 1200 BCE to 800 BCE, there was a stage that modern historiography called “Greek Middle Ages,” when the Dorians erected themselves as the native aristocracy and formed small “feudal” kingdoms constantly fighting against each

other, as the uprooted invaders from all eras liked to do. This stage was a heroic, individualistic age of personal glory, in which the warriors sought a glorious sunset. Many battles still were decided by a duel of champions: the greatest warrior of one side faced the best of the other. This represents the heroic but foolish mentality of the time: “the strong destroy each other and the weak continue to live.”

By that time Greece had not yet reached the image of the refined warrior equivalent to the medieval knight: the Dorians were still barbarians. For better or worse, all great civilizations began with hordes of warriors and hunters, tightly bound by ties of clan, and strongly disciplined by a militarized lifestyle. Nietzsche already noted the importance of the “barbarian” character in the formation of all aristocracy. For him, even when such invaders are established and form states, the basic underlying character is still, and subtly, barbaric in the forms of these raising states.

During the Greek Middle Ages, in 1104 BCE, the Heracleidae reached the Peloponnesus. Spartan history explained quite correctly that the Dorians invaded Greece eighty years after the destruction of Troy and, led by King Aristodemus, conquered the peninsula. Pausanias (second century, not to be confused with the Spartan prince who defeated the Persians at the battle of Plataea), in his *Description of Greece*, goes into more detail. He says that the Dorians, from a mountainous region of northern Greece called Oeta and guided by Hilo, a “son of Heracles” expelled from the Peloponnesus the Mycenaean Achaeans.

However, an Achaean counteroffensive held them back. Then, in a final process called Return of the Heracleidae, the Dorians definitely settled in the Peloponnesus and prevailed over the Achaeans, with great disturbances in the peninsula. The phrase-dogma of the “Return of the Heracleidae” was the way the Dorians had to justify the invasion of the Peloponnesus: noble Dorian families, distantly related to the Achaean noble families (both Dorians and Achaeans were Greeks), claimed what “rightfully” was theirs.

The new stream of Indo-European blood, courtesy of the Dorians, would eventually revitalize the ancient Hellas, keeping it in the spiritual and physical forefront of the time along with Persia, India, an Egypt that was not by then what it used to be, and China. In the south of the Peloponnesus peninsula, the Dorians established their main center, the city of Sparta, also known by its former name, Lacedaemon. The territory under the dominion of Sparta was known as Laconia.

The original city of Sparta or Lacedaemon was not properly a city; it consisted of a “cluster” of five villages (Pitan, Cynosur, Meso, Limnas and Amiclas, initially military garrisons) different but close and united, each with its high priest. The settlements always lacked defensive walls, proudly confident in the discipline and ferocity of their warriors. Antalcidas went on to say that “the young men are the walls of Sparta, and the points of their spears its boundaries.” The lack of walls helped them to stay alert and not allow in any relaxing. Hitler would say, with an identical mentality: “A too great feeling of security

provokes, in the long run, a relaxation of forces. I think the best wall will always be a wall of human chests!”

Sparta, however, was surrounded by natural defenses, as it was situated in the valley of the river Eurotas, between high mountains, with the Taygetos mountain range to the west and Parnon at the east. However, the lack of walls demonstrates the safety and confidence of the Spartans as well as certain arrogance.

In ancient Hellas three Indo-European streams would end up as the main ones: Firstly the rough Dorians, who spoke a Greek dialect that used the *a* and *r*. On the other hand, the soft Ionians, who came from a Greek invasion before the Dorians, dressed in flowing robes, oriental style, and spoke a kinder Greek dialect to the ear, which employed much *i* and the *s*. Other peoples of Greece were called Aeolians, who spoke a dialect that seemed a mix of Dorian and Ionian, and came from the ancient, mixed Achaeans and to some extent from the Pelasgians and later with the invading Dorians and Ionians—thus sometimes also called, erroneously, Achaeans.

First development of Sparta: the Messenian wars. During the eighth century BCE, Sparta, like other peoples of Hellas, was a small city-state ruled by a monarchy and aristocratic oligarchy of Doric descent. Driven by population growth and a need for resources and power, the Spartans looked to the West and decided that beyond the mountains Taygetus, in Messenia would create a nation of slaves to serve them.

The geopolitics of Laconia did not leave them much choice: they were on a rough terrain and isolated by mountains and a non-navigable river. Laconia was something like the heartland, or cardinal region of the Peloponnesus: an area inaccessible to any power that used the sea as a vector to project their power. So it was well protected from abroad, but in return the Laconians could not afford to sea as the coast was steep and there was only one suitable site to establish a port at Gythium, 43 km from the capital (unlike Piraeus, which was very close to Athens). Therefore, they could not follow the example of the Athenians, who jumped from island to island, colonizing the coasts and drawing large amounts of wheat from the north shore of the Black Sea.

On the other hand, the neighboring kingdom of Messenia had the most fertile plains of Hellas (“good for planting, good for plowing” said Tyrtaeus; “a happy grassland” the Spartans called it). By annexing it they would achieve autarkic supply of food and no longer need to rely on remote territories, trade, merchants, strategic islands, and maritime straits easy to control by the enemy or naval fleet.

Moreover, they would not cosmopolitanize, as usual with all trading nations. Sparta, then, was shaping up as a telurocracy—a geopolitical power of clearly continental type—opposed to the maritime Athenian thalassocracy.

Around 743 BCE, at a time when the Messenians were feasting and offering sacrifices to their gods, Sparta sent three lads dressed as maids. These little soldiers, well trained, carried short swords under their robes, and had no trouble infiltrating the carefree party atmosphere in Messenian territory. From inside they stalked the unarmed Messenia crowd, and at a given signal they began a bloody carnage in the thick of the crowd, before the Messenia mass subdued the boys. After the incident the Messenians grouped and, enraged, armed themselves and marched into Laconia. In the fight that broke out, one of the kings of Sparta fell, and the First Messenia War began (described by Tyrtaeus and Pausanias, who in turn relied on Myron of Priene).

After four years of war and a great battle, neither side emerged victorious. That was a deaf resistance, guerrilla style, and probably conventional armies had been relatively disrupted after the first battle. Although not adopting yet the tactics of the phalanx or Hoplite equipment, the most decisive actions were hand strikes, raids and sieges. However, the Messenians had suffered so many losses that a Messenian warlord, Aristodemus and his men, retreated to a fortress on Mount Ithome, and visited the oracle for advice. The oracle answered that to resist the Spartans a maiden of an ancient and respectable Messenian family should be sacrificed to the gods. Aristodemus, who was to be a great patriot, did not hesitate to sacrifice his own daughter. When the Spartans heard this, they rushed to make peace with the Messenians as, superstitious or not, they attached great importance to such ritual matters.

After some years, however, the Spartans decided to attack the Messenians again. There was another great battle, but the victory yet again did not go for any of the two sides. And since the Messenian king had fallen, the leader Aristodemus went to reign over the Messenians. In the fifth year of his reign he was able to expel from his territory the Spartan forces. However, Aristodemus seemed to be under a dark curse. In a Messenian temple a shield fell from the hand of the statue of the goddess Artemis. The sacrificed daughter of Aristodemus appeared as ethereal figure and asked him to take off his armor.

Artemis did it, and she crowned him with a golden crown, dressed in a white robe. According to the mentality of the time, all these omens meant that the death of Aristodemus was coming. Ancient peoples took these things very seriously. It was not superstition but the unraveling of the archetypal signs, repeated on Earth and echoing what was happening in the sky. Accordingly, black premonitions gravitated around Aristodemus. A dense depression took over his mind. He began to think that he and his nation were condemned to slavery. Believing he had sacrificed his daughter in vain, he committed suicide over her grave. The Greeks said that “one whom the gods wish to destroy they first make him crazy.”

The war lasted a total of nineteen years, and it was only after this time that the Spartans could exterminate Messenian resistance and raze the fortress of Ithome. Some Messenians

fled the Peloponnesian, and those who remained were treated more harshly than the very Helots of Laconia. They were relegated to be peasant vassals of Sparta at the Messenia fertile plain, and also forced them to pay half of the production of their land to their Spartan masters.

But the Messenians, much more numerous than the Spartans, were not satisfied with this situation of second-class and submitted people. Two generations after the First Messenian War a bold leader named Aristomenes, supported by the states of Argos and Arcadia, preached rebellion against Sparta. Following this, in the seventh century BCE the Second Messenian War began. With a band of loyal followers, Aristomenes starred numerous raids on Spartan territory, even weeping out two populations.

Three times he celebrated a Hecatomb sacrifice, a ritual only allowed to perform to those who had killed more than a hundred enemies. The Messenians, for the first time, used the Hoplite phalanx tactics characterized by close order formations, barricading behind a shield wall from which the spears stabbed with impunity. The Spartans had not yet adopted this form of combat from the Middle East, and suffered catastrophic casualties in the Battle of Hysiae.

Sparta then consulted the oracle of Delphi. There they were told to go to Athens to procure a leader. This was not supposed to please the Spartans, as their relations with Athens were not good, and neither pleased the Athenians for the same reason, but both States respected the decisions of Delphi and did not object. The Athenians, however, acted in bad faith: they sent a lame teacher called Tyrtaeus (known to posterity as Tyrtaeus of Sparta), thinking that he would not have value as military captain.

However, Tyrtaeus was a great poet. His chants of war inflamed the martial ardor of the Spartans and raised their morale. In the next battle against the Messenians, the Spartans marched already inflamed and in phalanx combat, singing his songs. With such impulse they defeated Aristomenes in the Battle of the Great Pit, forcing the Messenians to retreat to another mountain fortress called Ira, at whose feet the Spartan camp was established. This state of siege, in which guerrillas returned stronger than during the first war, lasted eleven years. Aristomenes often managed to break the Spartan siege in Ira and head toward Laconia, subjected to pillage. Twice he was captured by the Spartans and twice escaped.

The third time was captured along with fifty of his men, and they were paraded victoriously through Sparta as if they were a Roman triumph. Then they were taken to the foot of Mount Taygetos and thrown off a cliff, the famous Kaiada. According to Greek history, only Aristomenes miraculously survived the fall and was able to leave the abyss following a fox. Soon, he was in the fortress of Ira in front of his men.

But the Spartans ended infiltrating a spy into the fortress, and one night, after Aristomenes returned from one of his raids, the fort was betrayed. In the fierce battle that followed it is said Aristomenes was wounded and, clasping his bravest men, broke the Spartan lines and fled to Rome, where he died soon after. It is more than likely that this myth was built to revitalize Messenian pride: even 250 years later it was said that Aristomenes was seen in a battlefield fighting against the Spartans.

The Spartans conquered by spear and sword enough land to support all their people and maintain the other peoples subjected. They subjugated the Messenians, beat hostile crowds far more numerous than themselves and indisputably subjected them to their rule. Messenian coastal populations became a sort of middle-class commercial and navy populations, and the rest of the country, mere Helots (peasant rabble). Encompassing the entire southern half of the Peloponnesus, including the original territory of Laconia and the conquered land of Messenia, Sparta became the largest state in all Hellas by far—three times larger than the Attic state of Athens.

Unlike other Hellenic states, Sparta had chosen to be a continental land power of compact territory instead of engaging in seafaring and colonizing areas outside Greece, as other Hellenic states did in Asia Minor, Italy, the Black Sea or Africa. At least in part this was due to its immense agricultural potential: Messenia was the most fertile of the Greek world by far, while Athens suffered chronic lack of grain and continuously had to go to the Black Sea coast to look for it. Sparta had no such problems.

Think for a moment about how these battles, terribly fierce and long, could have influenced the Spartan character. The Messenian Wars marked forever their mentality. Ultimately, the teachers of the Spartans were their own enemies and the wars forced upon them. They were the ones who instituted in Sparta military paranoia and preparation for combat that characterized it; who forced Spartan aristocracy enter into crisis and, by necessity, find the best way to prevail over their enemies. Sparta would never have been what it became if in combat it had hit a cowardly people. Holding a long struggle against high-quality elements, bold and fearsome enemies to boast, aroused the Spartan force. Perhaps that is the only advantage of the unfortunate fratricidal wars, so typical of Europe.

Lycurgus and the Revolution. As said, between 1200 and 800 BCE, there were 400 years of “dark age” or Greek Middle Ages. The men were acting on personal glory; their behavior was inspired by the legendary feats of ancient individualist heroes. Blood brothers senselessly killed each other instead of uniting in a common will and not seeking personal glory but the glory of their people. Sparta herself was immersed in this heroic but fratricidal system, where every man was walking his way seeking his own immortality. Noble Dorians killed each other while their real enemies proliferated. Sparta was but a realm of many that existed in Hellas, and also pretty tumultuous and chaotic. But at the

end of the dark ages came a figure that heralded a new era: Lycurgus, the father of Sparta, the spokesman of Dorian blood: the man who made what Sparta would later become.

After quelling the second Messenian rebellion with great difficulty, the Spartans found themselves contemplating the disturbing picture of being on the brink of defeat; very vulnerable, and on the reins of a resentful and hostile foreign population that surpassed them in quantity of more than ten to one. And they were not easy slaves to subjugate, but Greek peoples who retained their identity, pride and will to power. All Spartans knew full well that the subjugated would rebel again one day sooner or later and that they must be prepared for the occasion. In this tense atmosphere, if Sparta could preserve its purity and survive it was thanks to Lycurgus.



It is not known when Lycurgus lived. Some say he belongs to the ninth century BCE, that is, before the Messenian wars, others to the eighth century, and others to the seventh. In any case, his extraordinary personality is of an ancestral legislator or “giver of tables.” Lycurgus is half historical and half legendary. His name means “conductor of wolves.” He was a veteran of the Messenian wars and the Heracleidae, and belonged to the royal line of the Agis, youngest son of King Eunomos, who had softened his regime to please the crowds. But these crowds were emboldened and the king fell stabbed with a butcher knife. Polydectes inherited the kingdom, his eldest son, but, having died suddenly, Lycurgus, his younger brother, succeeded to the throne. His reign lasted eight months but it was so right, fair and orderly compared to the previous anarchy that won the respect of his people forever. When Lycurgus knew that his sister-in-law (the former queen) was pregnant of his brother and late King, he announced that the fruit of such pregnancy would inherit the throne, the right thing, and therefore Lycurgus would become merely regent.

But the queen was an ambitious woman who wanted to continue enthroned, so she proposed Lycurgus to marry her and get rid of the baby as soon as he was born, so they

could become king and queen for life, and after them his own descendants. Lycurgus was furious at the proposal and rejected it vehemently. However, as a negative response would have meant that the party of the queen rise up in arms, he falsely sent messengers to accept the proposition. But when the baby was born, he sent servants with orders that if the child was a girl to be delivered to the mother; if boy to be handed over to him.

A male baby was born and was delivered as ordered. During a night he dined with military Spartans leaders and Lycurgus ordered the child to be brought, with the idea to let the leaders know there was already an heir. Lifting him with his arms and set him on the Spartan throne, said "Men of Sparta, here is a king born to us!" And since the heir still had no name, he named him Charilaus, "joy of the people." With this gesture, Lycurgus affirmed his loyalty to the heir and future king and made it clear that he should be protected, and that he became his guardian and protector until he was old enough to rule.

Meanwhile, Lycurgus as Regent was highly revered by the people, who admired his uprightness, honesty and wisdom. The queen mother, however, had not forgiven his refusal and that he kidnapped and made Charilaus known. Due to manipulation and intrigues, she spread the rumor that Lycurgus was conspiring to murder his nephew and become king of Sparta. When this rumor reached the ears of Lycurgus, he went into exile until Charilaus was old enough to reign, marriage and become heir to the Spartan throne. In his exile Lycurgus traveled through different kingdoms studying their laws and customs in order to improve the Spartan after his return. The first country he visited was the island of Crete, the Dorian settlement after Mycenae and of renowned wisdom, where he befriended the wise Tales, convincing him to go to Sparta to help him in his purpose.

Tales appeared in Sparta as a musician-poet, a kind of minstrel, throwing songs of honor and discipline to the people of Sparta, and preparing them for what was to come. The greedy and ambitious willfully abandoned their desire for wealth and material luxuries in the sake of unity in a common will with their race. Lycurgus also visited Ionia, where he not only studied Homer, but legend says that he knew him personally (here it is clear that certain dates do not add up). Lycurgus compiled his work and then made it known to his people, who liked it very much initiating the Spartan celebration of Homer. Another legendary feat attributed to Lycurgus was the founding of the Olympics.

Lycurgus also traveled to Egypt, where he spent time studying the Army training. He was fascinated by the fact that in Egypt the soldiers were lifelong soldiers, as in other nations warriors were called to arms in war and returned to their previous work in peacetime. Although this certainly was not the only purpose of his trip to Egypt, at the time it was a place visited by all those who sought initiation of ancient wisdom.

The Spartan Aristocrates says that Lycurgus also traveled to Iberia, Libya and India, where he met the famous wise gymnosophists, with whom Alexander would also meet centuries later. The gymnosophist school valued, among other things, nudity to the inclemency of

weather as a method to tan the skin and make the body and spirit resistant in general. As we will see later, this idea was greatly appreciated in Spartan education.

While Lycurgus was out, Sparta declined. The laws were not obeyed and there was no executive power to punish offenders. Upright men longed the time of the regency of Lycurgus and begged him: "It is true we have kings bearing the marks and assume the titles of royalty, but as for the qualities of their minds, nothing distinguishes them from their subjects. Only you have a nature made to rule and a genius to gain obedience."

Lycurgus returned to Sparta and his first action was to bring together thirty of the greatest military leaders to inform them of his plans. After these men swore loyalty he ordered to join, armed, in the market square at dawn with their followers to instill terror in the hearts of those who would reject the changes he planned. He compiled a blacklist of potential enemies to hunt them down and eliminate if needed. That day the square was packed with fanatical followers of Lycurgus, and the effect was so impressive that the king fled to the temple of Athena, fearing a conspiracy against him. But Lycurgus sent a messenger to inform him that all he wanted was to introduce new legislation to improve and strengthen Sparta. Thus reassured, the king left the temple and headed to the square, and joined the party of Lycurgus. With Lycurgus, the two kings and thirty military leaders, the party had thirty-three members.

But even with the support of the king, what Lycurgus had made was clearly a coup, a conquest of power or imposition of his will: a revolution. He had united his people, instilling a sense of cohesion that should characterize any grand alliance. The individual is nothing and the species everything. Or as Hitler would say to his followers: "You are nothing, your *Volk* is everything."

After developing his laws and make kings sworn they would respect them, Lycurgus reported that he would travel to the shrine of Delphi (the most important religious center of Hellas, considered "navel of the world") in search of counsel from Apollo, to ratify their decision. Near Delphi, marginal nucleus of Dorian population in the slopes of Mount Parnassus, he saw a shrine to this god with a legend that in that spot Apollo had killed the serpent Python (a telluric idol related to pre-Indo-European peoples). A whole school was there for all initiatory mysteries of Delphi. These mysteries were a venerable institution, Dorian to the core, to which the notables of all Hellas looked for advice, initiation, and wisdom. It was a highly strategic location: from the sea, the sanctuary dominates the heights and seems to lie above the navigator, and from Delphi, everything that comes and leaves the Gulf of Corinth is seen clearly.

The sanctuary was saying, "Here we are the Greeks, dominating the naval and the trade traffic it brings, and we are vigilant." In the temple of Apollo was a Sibyl, a virgin priestess who believed he had a special bond with this god and, like him, gifts of clairvoyance that were able to see the future and make prophecies. After receiving Lycurgus the Sibyl called

him “more god than man” and claimed he was a chosen of the gods, and announced that his laws were good and blessed his plans to establish the Spartan constitution, which would make the kingdom of Sparta the most famous of the world.

With the blessing of the priestess, Lycurgus established the Spartan constitution and his laws were so harsh and severe that he prohibited writing them down: only as oral tradition so that, over years of training, each individual assimilated them in his soul, by practice and internalization: something which would make him a carrier of such laws wherever he went and in any situation. His intention was not to create a mechanical, grid, stiff and cold system, but a living wheel: flexible and adaptable not only as common sense and logic, but also as an ancestral intuition and instinct.

By then Sparta was surrounded by hostile neighbors difficult to repel and possessed some nine thousand, non-militarized men to act in case of war or crisis. Lycurgus foresaw that if each of them was to be selected and trained hard in the arts of war since childhood, they would achieve victory over their opponents in spite of being outnumbered. Over generations, the people of Sparta would harden so much that would not be afraid of their enemies, and their fame would spread to the four cardinal points. Since then, Spartan boys became more than warriors: natural-born fighters with a lifelong mission, entirely committed in body and a soul sacrificed in honor of their homeland. They became, then, soldiers; perhaps the first professional soldiers in Europe.

Lycurgus did not exactly intend establishing a kind of democracy. On one occasion a man had before him a compliment of democracy, giving a fiery speech. Lycurgus, having heard all the talk in silence, replied: “Good, now go and set an example by establishing a democracy at home.” Keep in mind that even in those ancient “democracies” only Greek citizens voted, i.e. men of pure Hellenic blood who had reached the majority of age. They had nothing to do with our modern idea. Despite of this, there is no shortage of deceivers today who try to sell us that Sparta was a kind of communist system just because the state was omnipresent and the Spartans knew how to share among them.

Lycurgus’ revolution was not entirely peaceful. The Spartan people soon realized that the laws were extremely hard even for them. A considerable lineage of Dorian Greeks had become accustomed to the comfort and luxury that always come victorious when not maintained on guard. The sober, ascetic and martial socialism preached by Lycurgus, which required all young men to part from their families and eat with their comrades, was not well received among many, especially the rich and affluent. There was a wave of outrage and an angry mob gathered to protest against Lycurgus. The mob was composed especially by the former wealthy individuals who found degrading the military rule that prohibited eating except on a collectively table of comrades in arms. When Lycurgus appeared, the crowd began to stone him and he was forced to flee to avoid death by stoning. The angry mob chased him but Lycurgus—robust despite his age—was so fast that soon after only a young man named Alexander was at his heels.

When Lycurgus turned to see who was chasing him with such agility, Alexander struck him in the face with a stick, gouging out an eye. Lycurgus gave no sign of pain and just stood with his bloodied face to face his pursuer. When the rest of the crowd arrived they saw what the young man had done: a venerable old man, standing solemnly before them, bleeding with an empty eye. Those were very respectful times for the elderly, especially men as charismatic and noble as Lycurgus. Instantly they must have felt immense guilt. Embarrassed, the crowd accompanied Lycurgus to his home to show their apologies, and delivered Alexander to him to punish him as he saw fit. Lycurgus, now one-eyed, did not rebuke the young, but he invited Alexander to live with him as a student. The young man soon learned to admire and emulate the austere and pure way of life of his mentor. As tradition derived from that event, the Senators gave up the habit of attending state meetings with batons.

After the Spartan people swore the laws of Lycurgus, he decided to leave Sparta for the rest of his days. His mission was accomplished and he knew it; now he had to die giving an example of a strong will. Feeling nostalgic for his homeland and being unable to live away from her, he committed suicide by starvation. A man born for a particular purpose, once fulfilled that purpose he has no reason to linger earthbound. The ritual suicide has been practiced by many exceptional men whose mission was over, men who, after serving their fate, nothing was left in the world; they had lost the right to life. Nietzsche also spoke of voluntary death: “Many die too late, and some die too early. Yet strange soundeth the precept: “Die at the right time!”

Another version relates that before leaving Delphi, Lycurgus made the Spartan people swear to follow their laws at least until he returned from Delphi. And, having committed suicide without ever returning to Sparta, the Spartans were left with no choice but to always abide by the laws of Lycurgus.

For Sparta, Lycurgus was something of a precursor, a vanguard leader, a messenger before his time. He had royal power, and the sacred charisma of great leaders, kings, saints and emperors, “certain power that drew the wills” in the words of Plutarch. He came and transformed a chaotic and overflowing mass with great potential in the most effective army of Earth. He imprinted his world with a new inertia—his—, and gave a new aspect: what he wanted. After his death, a temple was erected in his honor and he was worshiped like a god. And it was from his time that not only Sparta but all Greece shone again: the beginnings of the Classic Age.

Xenophon greatly admired Lycurgus saying that he “reached the highest limit of wisdom” (*Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, 1). Savitri Devi referred to him as “the divine Lycurgus” and recalled that “the laws of Lycurgus had been dictated by Apollo at Delphi” (*The Hyperborean*). Gobineau appreciated the salvation led by the legislation of Lycurgus: “The Spartans were few in number but big-hearted, greedy and violent: a bad legislation would

have turned them into poor devils. Lycurgus transformed them into heroic bandits” (*An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, book I, chapter V).

The New Sparta. Forced to learn lessons after their very long wars with the Messenians, and illuminated by the laws of Lycurgus, the Spartans proceeded to build an army-camp nation. It was the knowledge of the power of subversion of the enemy and having been about to fall into their hands which made Sparta what later came to be. It was the paranoia of security, the distrust of the submitted peoples, what wrought Sparta over other Hellenic states and made them surrender to Lycurgus. As the Spartans were obsessed that their subjects, much more numerous, might rebel against their authority again, they chose to harden themselves and raise a new type of man under an authoritarian, totalitarian, militaristic, incorruptible and unquestionable power that they should obey blindly. Thereafter, the laws of Lycurgus acquired their greatest splendor. This was the period from which Sparta was unique in Hellas, the period in which “something changed,” the time when the people of Sparta, quietly and discreetly, suffered the strangest of transformations.

What was precisely this mutation? Among other things, the Spartans learned to direct their aggression not only against their enemies and rivals, but primarily against themselves and their peers in order to stimulate, purify and perfect themselves. In addition to tightening the practitioner, such behavior subtly loomed in the minds of the enemies the subconscious question, “If you do this to yourself, what will you do to your enemies?” Thus was born, then, military asceticism.

The Spartans were militarized. All the people went on organizational mood. Sparta became socialist and totalitarian—understood in its original sense of a civilization organized and disciplined by a gifted elite, formed with its best sons, and based on value-blood-spiritual-biological criteria. Such socialism is something that only could have taken place in the Iron Age, as it tried to bring together what was broken, and was more like an aristocracy than a democracy. Spengler described this type of militarist-imperialist-patriarchal system in his *Prussianism and Socialism*, noting how this system resurfaces again and again in history, incarnating in the larger towns and leading to empires. (Spengler distinguishes four superior socialisms: the Roman Empire, the Spanish Empire, the British Empire and Prussia, which resulted in the Second Reich. We would add two more socialisms: Sparta and the Third Reich.)

The caste organization in Sparta was tripartite: warriors, “bourgeois” and slaves.

(1) The Spartiates (Greek: *Σπαρτιάται*, “Spartans”). The upper class was that of the *Astoi*, *Damos* or citizens: the aristocracy, consisting of Dorian Spartans of pure lineage who owned *kleros* (a package of land) and that called themselves *Spartiates* or *Homoioi* (the same). To be “equal,” however, one had to be part of that jealous clan. That closed, selective and

elitist Order was the aristocracy of Sparta, which itself was strongly hierarchical and required as a condition of membership being born within a pure-blooded Spartan family, passing through strict eugenics (from the Greek word meaning “good birth”) and having passed awful trials during instruction. Only Spartan men, brutally trained and militarized to the core, were able to bear arms; though forbidden to fight each other in any way that was not combat. They could not afford the honor duels where men necessary fall instead of defending their country.

The custom of calling themselves “equal” is rooted in the collective unconscious of Indo-Europeans, as the Romans called each other “peers” like the English aristocrats, a word of the same meaning. All this reveals a sanctification of what is one’s own and similar, as well as a disregard for the foreign. In this establishment, the elite all *Hippeis* aspired was an elite guard of 300 men under 30 years.

The Spartiates were the descendants of the old army of Dorian invaders and their families, that is, the warrior nobility of the ancient Dorians: maybe the best blood of Hellas. They formed, therefore, the actual Spartan warrior caste, where there also came all priests. The caste of citizens, including women and children, never had more than 20,000 members. They were ten times less than the helots.

(2) The *Perioeci* (or *perioikoi*) means peripheral, people around, neighbors. They formed the middle class, a kind of bourgeoisie. They lived in villages with local government, without autonomy in military and foreign policy, and engaged mainly in trading, blacksmithing and crafts, activities that were forbidden to the Spartans. The *perioeci*, then, were those who were in charge of the money and the “logistics.” They were probably descendants of the lower strata of the ancient Dorian population mixed with the Achaeans, who in turn had previously dominated the Pelasgians and were mixed to some extent with them. They also came from people who had not resisted Sparta during the process of defining the polis. All coastal cities had Messenian *perioeci* status. The *perioeci* were entitled to a small *kleros*, lower in quality than the plain plots of Messenia, and they often supervised the helots, acting as intermediaries or foremen between them and the Spartans. They also constituted the crew of the navy (both commercial and naval war). The intermediaries between the *perioeci* and the Spartans were the Harmosts, twenty Spartans who administered the *perioeci*. Through them came to Sparta the food, weapons and craft goods.

(3) The Helots: Also called *heilotas* (“captives”), were at the bottom of social stratification. Most were Messenians, Pelasgians and other pre-Indo-Europeans in Greece, or mixtures between them. Their condition was dedicated servants to work the fields in perpetuity, but allowed to have possessions, that is, private property. A fixed amount of their crops was destined for their Spartan master, and the rest for them.

The helots were legally tied to the land and were forbidden to leave the *kleros* they cultivated, although it was forbidden to expel them from it. As the status was not slavery,

they could not be bought or sold. Thanks to these feudal measures Sparta never had to import large numbers of foreign slaves, as Athens ended up doing.

Helots mortally hated the arrogant Spartan nobility (Cinadon said they wanted to “eat them raw”), for which were often despised and humiliated. Only the unity, the savagery, the warlike character, and the organizational capacity and cruelty of the Spartan elite prevented them from being in continual rebellion. Because whenever a Spartiate ran into them they knew they were before a being who would have no difficulty in killing many with his own hands. This made the helot respect and fear the Spartiate, and Sparta was doing whatever necessary to cultivate this image. In Sparta, the castes knew each other: helots knew that the Spartans were superior and the Spartans knew the helots were their inferiors.

Helot numbers, according to the Greek historian Thucydides (460-395 BCE), ranged between 150,000 and 200,000. As markers of identity they should carry a shaved head, leather clothes and *kýne*: a dog-skin cap. Failing to comply to these outfits was punished with the penalty of death and a fine for the master of the helot.

Eugenics and early childrearing. The Spartan upbringing exudes what Nietzsche called “master morality” referring to the superior man, as opposed to “slave morality” that, for example, Christianity uses. What the Spartans did was to maximize natural selection to obtain a race of perfect men and women. Today, the cult of perfection raises uproar among the champions of the politically correct, always happy to say that perfection is unattainable, thereby seeking to justify and excuse their own laziness and even avoid approaching the subject. But Lycurgus and his disciples had contemplated this ideal of perfection as a goal and to achieve it they renounced all scruple adopting a detached philosophy, “beyond good and evil” in the vernacular.

It can be said that the system of eugenics preceded even birth, because the young pregnant maid and future mother practiced special exercises designed to encourage that their future child was born healthy and strong, and that labor was easy. There is nothing more insane than the present day, when women who have not played sports in their lives are forced to give birth in traumatic ways without the necessary physical and mental preparation, like a soldier going to war without military training.

Once the baby was born, the mother bathed him in wine. According to the Spartan custom body contact with the wine made the epileptics, decrepit and sickly enter into convulsions and fainted, so that the weak died soon, or at least could be identified for disposal, but the strong were as hardened steel. This may seem a kind of baseless superstition, but Aristotle himself defended it and the French Enlightenment criticized as “irrational” the peasant custom of bathing newborns with water with wine: a sign that in the 18th century rural France the custom continued. We now know, for example, that a

bath of alcohol hardens the feet, preparing them to support prolonged activity. We also know that red wine contains tannins, substances of plant origin that are used for tanning leather and other animal skins and make them tough and resistant to extreme temperatures and microbial invasions.

If the baby passed the test, he was taken by his father to the *Lesjé* (“porch”) and inspected by a council of wise elders to judge his health and strength, and to determine whether it would be able to withstand a Spartan life. All babies that were not healthy, beautiful and strong were taken to Apothetae (“place of rejection”) on the Eastern slope of Mount Taygetos (2407 meters high), from which were thrown into Kaiada (Spartan equivalent to the Roman Tarpeian Rock), a pit located 10 km northwest of Sparta. To this day, Kaiada is a place that has always been surrounded by sinister legends. Not only defective children were thrown into the depths, but also enemies of the state (cowards, traitors, Messenians rebels and suspects) and some prisoners of war. Recently numerous skeletons have been discovered buried there, including women and children.

At other times the defective were delivered to the helots to be raised as slaves, but maybe this should be read that sometimes a caring shepherd (or rather a pastor needed for labor) picked up a baby who had been abandoned to the elements to die, taking him home and raising him as a son.

Let us recall, moreover, that the ancient Germans abandoned defective babies in the woods to be devoured by wolves. In the SS, babies being born deformed, weak or sick were stifled at birth, and subsequently informed the parents that the child was stillborn. According to Plutarch, for the Spartans, “leaving alive a being that was not healthy and strong from the beginning did not benefit either the State or the individual himself.” Under this principle there were executed, in an act of true compassion, all babies who were not perfectly healthy. Along with eugenics this was aristogenesis (“best birth” or “birth of the best”).

What Nature usually has done in a slow and painful way the Spartans did so quickly and almost painlessly, saving unnecessary work and suffering. Rather than ignoring the laws of nature—as does the modern techno-industrial society by getting into the red with Nature and the future—the Spartans rose Nature’s laws to the maximum exponent, and created a world where it was impossible to escape from them.

Most Hellenic States (like all Indo-European peoples of antiquity, as well as many non-Indo-European) followed similar eugenic-selection tactics in which it was assumed that the right to life was not for everyone, but that it must be earned proving oneself strong and healthy. This idea comes from the unconscious conviction that the people to which one belongs has internalized a pact with Nature. In the rest of Greece, eugenics was optional and the decision was up to the fathers, so that the babies were selected privately as a domestic policy. In Sparta, on the other hand, the selection was a fully

institutionalized state policy. The Spartans saw in these measures a matter of life and death, and survival in terms of community of blood. They assumed these measures with conviction, because in the past the measures had helped them to overcome extremely adverse situations. Its aim was to ensure that only the fit survive and favor evolution, thus maintaining a high biological level for the country and, on this basis, make an improvement on all levels.

Babies who survived the selection were returned to their mothers and incorporated into a male or female brotherhood according to their sex—usually the same one to which belonged his father or mother. Little or nothing is known about these brotherhoods, maybe guilds where children were initiated into religious worship. After being accepted into this fraternity, they went to live with their mothers and nannies, growing up among women up to their seventh year.

During these seven years, the female influence would not soften the children, as these were women who could raise their offspring without softening them. Spartan mothers and nannies were an example of solid maternity: harsh young, severe, and virtuous women imbued with the profound importance and sacredness of their mission. They had been trained since birth to be real women—to be mothers. Any excessive tenderness or compassion for their child was removed. If the baby was defective he should be killed, and if not, should be tanned as soon as possible to be able to withstand a Spartan life. The first years of the existence of a toddler marked him for the rest of his life and this was understood by the Spartan women, who carefully applied themselves into the task of raising men and women.

Instead of swaddling the babies in bandages, warm clothes, diapers and blankets like larvae, the nursing mothers of Sparta put them on supple, thin and light fabrics; freeing the limbs so they could move them at will and experience the freedom of the body. They knew that babies have a fresher and intact immune system than adults, and if they were taught to endure cold and heat at an early age, not only they would not resent it, but would harden them and make them more immune in the future. Instead of giving in to the cries of babies, Spartan women accustomed them not to complain. Instead of allowing whims for food or overfeeding them with super-purified, ultra-hyper-sterilized and disinfected food that made their immune systems lose attention, they fed them with a coarse and natural diet. Instead of committing the aberration of feeding them with animal, pasteurized, boiled milk stripped of its natural qualities, Spartan women nursed their children themselves, helping to form the maternal bonding.

During the first seven years one more task was ensured so that the infants faced their fears. Spartan mothers and nannies resorted to various methods. Instead of allowing babies to develop fear of the dark, newborns were left in the dark so they could get used to it. Instead of making the babies feel they do not fend for themselves, they were often left alone. They were taught not to cry or complain; to be tough and endure loneliness,

although they did remove the objects or impede situations that could make children upset or cry justifiably.

Little Spartans were not exactly pampered like children today are overprotected, overfilled with warm clothes, bulky diapers, hats, scarves, mittens, booties, lace, bells, effeminate and garish designs that make the poor creature look like a ridiculous, swollen and multicolored ball: restricting his growth, stunting his immunity, isolating him from his environment and preventing feeling it, adapting to it and developing a complicity with it. They were not surrounded by sycophants at all hours hanging on their whining. Nor were subjected to concerts of cries, cuddles and hysterical laughter from unhealthy women: noises that confuse the child and make him feel uncomfortable and ridiculous.

Spartan mothers did not reprimand their children when they showed curiosity, or when they ventured or soiled in the field; or when they went alone or out exploring or playing hurt because that would hinder their initiative. This custom of over-pampering children and reproaching when taking risk is not typical of Indo-European, demanding and manly societies. Spartan children were allowed to penetrate nature, run through the fields and woods; climb trees, rocks, getting dirty, bloodied, being together and fighting and walking totally naked; not letting outdoors a single portion of untanned skin.

All physically and spiritually healthy men felt the call of heroism, war and weapons from an early age: an instinct that the race has injected them into the blood to ensure its defense. Far from encouraging a distaste for violence that is always given to children, the Spartan women encouraged it when possible. Each time the children looked a Spartan soldier it was created around him an aura of mystery and adoration: they admired him and had him as model and example, and wanted to emulate him soon.

As a result of these wise policies Spartan nurses were famous in all Hellas, for their ways produced as mature, tough, disciplined and responsible children that many foreigners rushed to hire their services to raise their own children under Spartans methods. For example, the famous Athenian Alcibiades (450-404 BCE), nephew of Pericles and student of Socrates, was raised by the Spartan nurse Amicla.

The education of children

The discipline of suffering, of great suffering—do you not know that it is *this* discipline alone which has created every elevation of mankind hitherto?

—Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*

At seven years of age—the age at which the pituitary and pineal glands begin to degenerate—, Spartan children were tougher, stronger, wiser, fiercer and more mature than most adults of today. And even though they were not men, they were already well

prepared for the arrival of masculinity. At this age—five according to Plutarch—they began their *Agoge*, which means training or instruction. (It is intriguing how this coincided with the learning process of European medieval chivalry, when at seven children were separated from their families and became apprentices. Seven years later, at the age of fourteen, passed to be squires. And seven years later, at twenty-one, they were knighted.)

A motion process was set related to maternal influence—reminiscence of the time of delivery—, and in a single blow the other, intangible “umbilical cord” was cut, which still subsisted between mother and son. Children were torn, therefore, from their mothers and placed under military tutelage with other children of the same age, under the command of an instructor, the *paidonomos*: a kind of supervisor who was usually an outstanding lad between eighteen and twenty years old who would soon end his own instruction. When he was absent for some reason, any citizen (that is, any Spartan male who had already finished his instruction) could order them whatever, or punish them as he saw fit. Instruction lasted no more and no less than thirteen years, during which children were already educated and disciplined by men, in order to become men.

The *Agoge* is perhaps the most brutal and effective system of physical, psychological and spiritual training ever created. The education that Spartan children received was obviously of paramilitary type, which in some cases was clearly oriented to guerrilla war in the mountains and forests, for the child to fuse with nature and feel like the king predator. For all we know it was a superhuman process, a living hell almost of spiritual and physical alchemy, infinitely harder than any military training of the present because it was far more dangerous, lasting (thirteen years), exhausting, and because the tiniest faults were punished with huge doses of pain—and because the “recruits” were children of seven years.

Immediately after entering the *Agoge*, the first thing done to the kids was shaving their heads. Certainly that was the most convenient for those who were destined to move through dense vegetation, bite the mud and fight each other. But the sacrifice of the hair implied a kind of “mystical death”: waived possessions, decorations, individuality and beauty were renounced, even one’s own welfare was neglected (the hair is important for physical and spiritual health). The “recruits” were homogenized and given a sense of nakedness, loneliness, helplessness and of a beginning (babies are born bald), a “start from scratch,” throwing them sharply to a world of cruelty, pain, resignation and sacrifice.

This is not isolated or arbitrary. The first armies, composed of many men who had to live together in a small space, saw the need to keep the hair short to prevent the spread of lice and disease. Furthermore, a shaved head must have meant something more to them. The Egyptian priests of the highest degree, the Roman legionaries and the Templars also shaved the head as well as, to this day, Buddhist monks and numerous military units. When a group becomes uniform its members will not be differentiated anymore by their “personal” appearances or by their external differentiations, but for the qualities that

protrude from scratch on equal footing with their comrades. Paradoxically, standardizing a group is the best method to observe carefully what really distinguishes individuals.

Children understood what it was suggested: giving up on themselves, or as Goethe said “give up existence in order to exist.” Only the one who does not cling pathetically to his life can live as a real man, and only one who does not cling desperately to his ego and his individuality may reach a truly consolidated and distinct character.

After shaving the head, children were organized by *Agelai* (hordes or bands) in paramilitary style. The hardest, more beautiful, fiercest and fanatical children (i.e., the “natural leaders”) were made horde chiefs as soon as identified. In the area of doctrine and morals, the first thing was to inculcate the recruits love for their horde: a holy obedience without limits for their instructors and their bosses, and make it clear that the most important thing was to show immense energy and aggressiveness. For his brothers his relations were perpetual rivalry and competition. Those children were treated like men, but those who treated them so would not lose sight they were still children. They were also stamped with the mark that distinguishes every fierce and confident puppy of his abilities: impatience, the desire to demonstrate and be tested, and the desire to be distinguished by his qualities and merits within his pack.

Inherent to the Spartan instruction was the feeling of selection and elitism. Would-be candidates were told they were the best of Spartan childhood, but that they had to prove it, and that not everyone was worthy of becoming a real Spartan. They got into their heads that they were not all equal, and therefore were all different. And if they were different some were better or worse or had different qualities. And, if so, the best should be over the worst, and each placed in its rightful place according to their qualities. This is why an Order was named thus.

Children were taught to use the sword, the spear, the dagger and the shield, and they marched in close formation even in rough terrain, making the movements with precision and perfect timing. A hardening, physical processes prevailed and they were delivered to many physical exercises designed to encourage the development of their strength and their latent warlike qualities: running, jumping, javelin and disc hurling; dancing, gymnastics, swimming, wrestling, archery, boxing and hunting are some examples.

To promote competitiveness and fighting spirit, and to accustom them to violence and teamwork, hordes of Spartan children were made to compete with each other in a violent ball game which was basically a variant, much freer and brutal, of rugby. The players were called *sfareis* (ball players). We can imagine those little shaven heads delivering each other wild jolts in every possible way, colliding, dodging and trying to fight for coordination, obtaining possession of the ball and taking it to the agreed target, beyond the opponent's territory and over the bodies of the opponent. We almost can, also, hear the thuds, the screams, the coordination signals, the creaking of the elbows, knees, punches, the headers,

the tackles and sprains there must have happened in that game that transformed characters and personalities and leaders as a smith.

In the sanctuary of the goddess Artemis took place many melee fighting rituals among the very young Spartans. They were also faced without further ado horde against horde, child against child or all against all, in fierce fights tooth and nail and clean punches to stimulate aggression, competition and an offensive spirit, to develop their sense of mastery in the chaos of struggles and to build hierarchies. It is easy to imagine the chipped teeth, crushed noses and cheekbones, bloody faces and hands, fainting and open heads in those fierce children fights. In addition, instructors were responsible for setting them on so that they measured the forces between them, provided it was only for competition and desire to excel, and when they saw the foaming of hatred to emerge, the fight was stopped. Perhaps it would have been normal that at the end of the fight the opponents would salute or compliment each other, commenting the fight among them, with their peers and with their instructors and trying to learn. In Sparta ruled that ancient cult that we may call “mysteries of the fight.”

Besides boxing and wrestling the Spartans also exercised other popular martial art in Greece: the *pankration*. It consisted of a mix of boxing and wrestling, similar to the modern disciplines of mixed martial arts and vale tudo, but more brutal: participants could incorporate into the bands of their fists the accessories of what they believed was suitable to increase their offensive power: some added pieces of wood, tin foil and even lead plates.

The rules were simple: everything was allowed but biting, poking in the eyes, nose or mouth of the adversary. It was also forbidden to deliberately kill the opponent, but yet many were those who died in this bloody sport. In those combats if you could not proclaim a winner before sunset they resorted to *klimax*, a solution equivalent to tie on penalties in soccer games. By turns, each wrestler had the right to hit the other, without the receiver being allowed to dodge or defend in any way. One who would strike the blow told his opponent what position he should take to receive the attack. The goal was to see who first fell out of combat.

Greek history gives us an example with a bout between such and such Damogenes and Creugas, which reached a “draw,” so *klimax* was applied. After drawing lots, the first to hit was Creugas, who asked his opponent to come down the arms, so that he gave him a powerful punch in the face. Damogenes received the tremendous blow with dignity, after which he asked Creugas lift his left arm. Immediately afterwards he inserted his fingers violently under his ribs and tore the bowels out.

The pacifists and progressives of today that praise Greece should know that force, ferocity and violence were worshiped, in addition to wisdom. The Greeks philosophized and were “civilized,” yes, but when needed (or just as a hobby) they knew how to be perfect

animals. That was their duality—a duality of union, not separation, a duality that sought the perfect integration of mind and body, light in darkness, overcoming their separation.

In all the struggles, battles, competitions and games, the instructors put great attention to distinguish whether each child's screams were of anger, stress or aggression; or of pain and fear in which case they were punished. If a boy complained to his father that he had been hit by another child, his father gave him a beating for snitching and failing to seek life: "Complaining is of no use at all: it is something that comes from weakness." And that weakness, in a Spartan, was unacceptable. As said, all citizens had the right to reprimand the children, so that parents had authority over their own children and those of others.

Thus, each parent treated other children as he wanted others treat his, as Xenophon observed. If a child, then, complained to his father that a citizen had given him lashes, the father whipped him even more. In Sparta all was this rotund, blunt, brutal and simple. Indeed, every Spartan child called "father" any adult male, similar to when today we respectfully call "grandfather" an elderly stranger. This habit of calling "father" the grown-ups also was suggested by Plato in his *Republic*, a book that looks like a carbon-copy of Sparta.

It is through the conquests, victories and defeats that the warrior does know himself and the enemy—in the case of Sparta, his fellows. And when a man knows himself, his neighbors and the enemy, wisdom of life is accomplished. Thus he acquires security, prudence, intuition and high confidence. Each Spartan knew his brother because surely he had fought against him, or seen him fight, or had played with him in this rough rugby, or otherwise had suffered together. His whole life was a civil war. They fought against themselves and each other, which did not mean they were no longer together: quite the opposite. This system was a useful outlet for the anger of the race, which was elsewhere tragic in fratricidal conflict, and Sparta almost harmlessly vented such aggression in competitions.

All aspects of the Spartan child's life were regulated to increase his insensitivity to suffering and aggression. You will be put under a ruthless discipline that requires you to learn to control pain, hunger, thirst, cold, heat, fear, fatigue, disgust, discomfort and lack of sleep. You will be taught survival skills in the field including tracking, guidance, hunting, water extraction and knowledge of edible plants. This will reduce your dependence on civilization and you will be put in touch with the tradition of our hunter-gatherer ancestors of more primitive times.

To achieve all this, the strict and unscrupulous instructors used any means possible to their reach. Wear situations imposed on the young were so intense that they would probably come to a state very close to dementia, with the presence of hallucinations induced by lack of sleep and food. The *mastigophora* (carriers of the whip) were charged to

brutally beat and even torture anyone who failed, complained or moaned in pain, so that the tasks came up perfect.

Sometimes children were whipped for no reason, only to harden them, and the Spartan boys would rather die than groan and ask why they were whipped. Spartan philosophy coincided with Nietzsche's when they thought "Blessed is what hardens us!" There even were competitions to see who could hold the most numerous and intense lashes without shouting. This was known as *diamastigosis*.

Sometimes the priestess of Artemis ordered that, in her presence and before an image of the goddess, some children chosen by her to be whipped. If the ceremony-torture was not liked by the priestess she ordered the whipping intensified. These children not only had the obligation not to show pain, but to show joy. The macabre winner of the competition was he who endured longer without complaint. It happened that some died without groaning. It would be said that this is sadomasochistic nonsense, but we cannot judge an ancient custom with modern mentality.

Surely the event inculcated in the victims the notion of sacrifice for the archetype of their homeland (Artemis) and taught them to master suffering with that divinity in mind. Meanwhile, in the rest of Greece athletes underwent voluntarily lashes sessions since it helped tighten their skin and body, and purging the impurities. And Sparta was, undeniably, an athletic state. (He who has been in countries where lashes are still used as punishment will have noticed how much the unfortunate victim transpires, leaving a huge puddle on the floor at the end of execution.)

Nietzsche described the lack of pity towards the promising candidates: "I spare you not, I love you from my very heart, my brethren in war!" And in words that seem aimed at an instructor, a manufacturer of overmen, he says: "To thee one law—be pure and bright!" Compassion was the worst poison for Sparta, because it preserved and prolonged the life of all weak and dying—whether it was compassion towards themselves, their peers or the enemies. In the *Song of the Lord*, the monumental Indo-Iranian *Bhagavad-Gita*, it is written that "the truly wise mourn neither for the living nor for the dead."

To suffer and endure pain without complaining was part of the Spartan idiosyncrasy. Boys were proud of the amount of pain they could endure through clenched teeth, and remember that Nietzsche also said that the degree of suffering to which a man is able to tolerate determines his hierarchical place. It is perfectly understandable that this kind of stoicism be interpreted as a masochistic cult of suffering, but we must avoid falling into this error of interpretation. In Sparta the suffering was a means to awaken the fighter's instincts of a man and to liaise with his body and with Earth itself. Suffering was not meekly accepted with the head down: it was struggled to dominate it, and everything was intended to achieve indifference to suffering—unlike the masochistic cults, as are some

variants of modern Christianity or the modern “humanitarian” atheist which produces sentimental and tender beings even for the pain of others.

Loyalty was a very important part of Spartan training. According to Seneca, “Loyalty is the holiest good in the human heart,” and according to Goethe, it “is the effort of a noble soul to match a bigger soul than his.” Loyalty conducted the children towards higher forms and served to make them greater. Spartan boys were inculcated into unswerving loyalty to themselves, their peers and their own Order—i.e. the Spartan state. “My honor is called loyalty,” said the SS, and it could have also been a good motto for the Spartans. For them, loyalty was an asceticism that led them down the road of the right order, morality of honor (*aidos* and *timè*) and compliance with the sacred duty.

As mentioned, obedience was also paramount in the instruction, but to what extent was such obedience fulfilled? The answer is: it had no bounds. It was put to the test every day. A Spartan boy could be ordered to kill a helot child or provoke a fight with a partner, and it was assumed he would not ask questions but obey quietly and efficiently. He could be given seemingly absurd or unworkable orders to test him, but the important thing was that, without hesitation, he blindly and unquestioned sought the obedience of such order. Obeying was sacred and basic, because the higher knows something the subordinate does not know. In the Army it is said, “He who obeys is never wrong.” Young Spartans were constantly tested. If a Spartan boy were told to jump off a cliff, he probably would not have hesitated and would throw himself without blinking and furious conviction.

All this, to profane eyes, all of it may seem exaggerated and outrageous, but the profane still does not understand what it means. When the individual is sure to belong to “something,” of being directly in the service of the divine, the orders are not questioned because they come from Above, from somewhere they cannot understand—for now. Serving a similar but higher individual is self-serving, because that control is the community of which the individual is a part. When all the pieces of a gear assume their role with conviction it gives a general sense of calm, confidence, and order that allows men to perform the most dangerous and heroic deeds naturally.

Adolf Hitler said: “the conviction that obeying the voice of duty works for the conservation of the species helps the most serious decisions.” If something unjust is ordered it was for the greater good, and in any case questions were never asked. They were obeyed for the sake of obedience, as part of a military-monastic discipline. Obeying an order was obeying to oneself and to the clan, because the chief was an embodiment of the will of the clan. Nietzsche himself advised: “So live your life of obedience and of war!” This magic of loyalty, duty and obedience is what leads the great men to the path of glory.

Instruction was outdoors. The Spartan boys were always immersed in Nature: in nature’s sounds, vibrations, landscapes, animals, trees, changes, cycles and nature’s will. They learned to join their homeland; know it, love it and consider it a home. They were forced

always to walk barefoot and directly touch the earth: feeling it, understanding it, connecting directly to it as trees. The masseuses know that the feet are the “remote control” of the bodily organs. Having your feet directly in contact with the earth is, undoubtedly, an important massaging effect on the whole body—a destroyed effect today with soles and heels that rumple the natural shape of the foot at work. And not only that: walking bare feet hardened the feet as wood, and eventually the young Spartans moved more lightly on the land than those who had softened their feet with shoes, as feet are designed for that, and if presently this does not work is because we did not develop them, nor tanned them as would be natural.

In winter, Spartans children had to take baths in the icy river Eurotas. They dressed alike in winter than in summer, and slept outdoors on hard reeds torn by the river and cut by hand. The maneuvers and marches they carried out were exhausting, and would kill almost any man of our day—in fact some Spartan boys died of exhaustion. Gradually, the bodies of the boys grew accustomed to cold and heat, developing their own defense mechanisms. Gradually, they became increasingly harder, stronger and more resistant.

As nutrition, they were deliberately assigned an insufficient ration, which included the harsh and bitter Spartan black bread and the famous Spartan *melas zomos* (black soup), which was downright inedible for any non-Spartan. (The bitter black bread was also common in the German military of World War II.) It is said it contained, among other things, blood and pig entrails, salt and vinegar (think of the ingredients of the sausage or black pudding). Probably the ingestion of such concoction was itself a practice of self-control that helped to harden the mouth, stomach and digestive tract. Spartan food, generally, was considered by other Greeks as very strong, if not disgusting. (The development of very strong “delicacies” whose mere ingestion shows courage and resistance is a common military motif. Think of a concoction called “panther’s milk” including condensed milk and gin, popular in the Spanish Legion who sometimes even added gunpowder.)

Moreover, rough and scanty food rations moved the Spartan boys to seek their own food by hunting and gathering or theft, which they themselves cooked. If discovered in the act of stealing food they would expect brutal beating or whipping and deprivation of food for several days, and not for stealing the food which could be stolen from the helots—but for having been caught. Somehow, this reminded the tradition of “right of prey” of the ancient Indo-European hordes: ancient armies usually lacked any campaigns of logistics and survived thanks to taking it from Nature or by plundering their enemies and indigenous populations.

Sparta wanted to teach people to obtain food by their own and getting them used to this; thus adapting them to a lifestyle of uncertainty and deprivation. They lived in a perpetual state of war, and they wanted a right mentalizing. Already Xenophon said, “A hunter, accustomed to fatigue, makes a good soldier and a good citizen.” On the other hand,

Sparta greatly respected the animals and like the Dorians even retained archaic cult divinities with animal parts (like the Apollo Karneios with ram's horns), which symbolizes the condensation of the totemic qualities associated to the animal in question. Spartan boys who lived in the open should have felt identified with many of the animals around them, forging a certain complicity with them.

We know the story of the Spartan boy who, having captured a fox as food, hid it under his cloak to hide from a group of approaching soldiers. The fox, desperate, began using his teeth and claws to attack the child's body, but he endured it without shouting. When the blood flowed, the fox became more aggressive and began to rip pieces of flesh of the child, literally eating him alive. And the boy endured the pain without screaming. When the fox had come to his gut, gnawing the organs, the small Spartan fell dead and silent in a discrete pool of blood, without leaving out a moan or even having shown signs of pain. It was not fear that made him hide his hunting, for surely that slow and painful death was worse than a lot of lashes. It was his honor, his discipline, the capacity for suffering, will, strength and toughness—qualities that in his short life he had developed more than any adult in the present. This macabre anecdote, related by Plutarch, is not intended as an apology (after all, Sparta lost in this child an excellent soldier), but an example of Spartan stoicism, which sometimes reached delirious extremes.

With measures of food shortages they wanted to encourage the body, by being deprived from growth in the width, to have more strength and stature. (This produced results, as Xenophon described Spartans as higher than the other Greeks, although heredity also played an important role in this.) They favored the emergence of higher, compact, robust, flexible, slender, hard, agile, strong and athletic bodies; taking a maximized advantage of it with a concentrated, trimmed and fibrous-to-the-end muscles, not prone to injury and with great endurance to pain, fatigue, hunger, thirst, heat, cold, disease, shock, tremendous efforts or prolonged and terrible wounds.

Those were not bodies with overdeveloped muscles, requiring an immense diet and constant and impractical maintenance. Bodies were concentrated, whole and proportionate, designed to survive with the minimum: perfect biological machines which could be studied at a glance in every vein, every tendon, every ligament, every muscle and muscle fiber at the skin's surface. Their strength should have been awesome, otherwise they would not have been able to live, march and fight with the full force of weapons, armor, shield, etc. Plutarch said that the bodies of the Spartans were "hard and dry." Xenophon, on his part, stated that "it is easy to see that these measures could only produce an outstanding race and strength and building. It would be difficult to find a people more healthy and efficient than the Spartans."

This was the most appropriate body for the fighter. Plato in his *Republic*, made clear that the careful diet and regimen of specific exercises that the athletes practiced made them not to surrender when suddenly they were deprived from their routines—during a military

campaign for example—, as their bodies were too used to have such amount of nutrients and rely on them. In extreme situations, such bodies reacted instinctively by reducing muscle mass and producing exhaustion, weakness and malaise. At the Battle of Stalingrad many German fighters inexplicably dropped dead. It was later learned that it was a combination of both hunger, cold and exhaustion. The most affected by this death were precisely the burly and massive men, that is, those requiring more maintenance in terms of food and rest.

Wrestlers of all ages were able to understand this, among them the Roman legionaries who looked for hard, strong and concentrated bodies; and the SS, who exercised without pause, eating a poor diet that included the famous porridge oats: a porridge that so much influenced physiologically the proverbial impassivity of both the English and the Swedes. (We know that oats also influences the tranquility of racehorses, and the athletic diets usually incorporate it.)

As shown by their lifestyle, the Spartans were certainly muscular, but not overdone as far as volume is concerned. They were not massive like the body-builder monsters of today, and to be sure of what we say it is enough to see the nutritional deprivation they suffered, and the exercise regimen they had, so abundant and intense in aerobic efforts. Their level of definition and muscle tone, however, must have been awesome.

Spartan boys were taught to observe, to listen, to learn, to be discreet, not to ask questions and assimilate in silence. They were taught that withdrawal or surrender in battle was a disgrace, that all combat should end in victory or death and that, as Xenophon said, “A death with honor is preferable to a life without honor.” Or in the words of Nietzsche, “To die proudly when it is no longer possible to live proudly.”

The Spartans, like the Celtic Druids and the perfect Cathars and Templars were forbidden to do heavy manual work: their job was war. However, when giving up manual labor they also renounced the fruits of such work: They were imbued with austerity, simplicity and asceticism in all aspects of his life, eliminating anything that might soften or weaken them. Their gestures were measured, reduced, and righteous, and their manners solemn and respectful. Their houses totally lacked any decoration and had a rustic and rough look, of stone and wood. The aim was to increase the lack of need for each Spartan, his personal self-sufficiency.

In fact, they were not allowed the luxury of the language, so they spoke the right words, dryly, directly, firmly and martially. A Spartan child should remain silent in public, and if you spoke to him he had to respond as soon as possible, with elegance and conciseness, military-style. The Spartan language was like the Spartan village: scanty but of high quality. It was a language of voice, command and obedience. It was infinitely more unpleasant in sound, more mechanical, hard and rough even than the legionnaire Latin or the most

martial German. The rough Dorian dialect spoken in Sparta, the “laconic,” has become synonymous with dryness and simplicity of speech.

And simplicity of speech is essential for a higher spirituality. Lao Tzu, the legendary messenger of Taoism, said “To speak little is natural.” There are numerous and illustrative examples of Spartan brevity. This is a good one: On one occasion in which a Spartan garrison was about to be surrounded and attacked by surprise, the Spartan government simply sent them the message: “Warning.” That was enough for men spending a lifetime in military exercising. “To a good listener, few words” (are enough) says Spanish proverb.

The Spartan laconic manners are the direct opposite to the vulgar quackery of today when many opinionated, hysterical voices blend miserably without harmony, destroying silence with nonsensical words: a silence that would be infinitely preferable to that hustle. Speech is far more important than what is accepted today. It condenses communication between people, decisively influencing the way that the individual perceives those around him, particularly his fellow-men. The individual learns to know himself better through knowledge of their fellows, and the concept he has of their peers will have an echo in his own self-esteem. Nietzsche himself, a scholar of philology, attached great importance to speech, dedicating lengthy paragraphs to it.

To learn about politics, solemn manners, respect for the elders and government affairs, Spartan children were taken to the Army guilds or Syssitias (which I will describe later), where young and old men philosophized, talked, and discussed about the affairs of the day. Plutarch said that for the very young attendance at these circles was like a “school of temperance” where they learned to behave like men and “trick” an adversary. They were taught to make fun of others with style, and face teasing. Should it be bad a joke, they should declare themselves offended and the offender immediately ceased. The grown-ups tried to test children to know them better and identify their strengths, and the children should manage to make a good impression and look good during those congregations of attentive veterans, responding with greater ingenuity and promptly to the most twisted, malicious and gimmick questions.

In the Syssitias children learned also the aristocratic and ironic humor typical of the Spartans, learning to joke with elegance and humorously. It is not strange at all that a people like the Spartans, aristocratic, solemn and martial, accorded great importance to humor and laughter—the Spartans had to be especially masters of black humor. Although the helots probably found fascinating the seriousness of the Spartans and would consider them repressed, the Spartans among themselves were like brothers. On order by the very Lycurgus, a statue of the god of laughter decorated the Syssitias. Laughter was indeed of great therapeutic importance. We can imagine the joy, the emotions and laughter that were heard in the sporting competitions, matches and tournaments of Sparta, as in the hour of playing and competing the most solemn and trained men become children.

Education, courtesy and manners were greatly appreciated in Sparta. Why was this so important? Simply because when members of a group follow exemplary behavior, respect prevails; and you want to do well to maintain the honor and gain the respect of your comrades. Further, when members of a group indulge in deplorable attitudes or decadent diversions, respect diminishes, and the prestige within the group disappears. Why earning the respect of the unworthy through sacrifice if they not even respect the spirit of excellence? The result is plain to see when those renounce to act exemplarily: one is left to soak in the degenerated atmosphere and imitates what he sees. The Spartans sensed this, and established a strict code of conduct and solemn manner at all times to start a virtuous circle.

Spartan instructors often caught the helots and forced them to get drunk; dress ridiculously, dance grotesque dances and sing stupid songs (they were not allowed to recite poems or sing songs of the “free men”). Thus adorned they were presented to the children themselves as an example of the damage caused by alcohol, and the undesirability of drinking too much or drinking at all.

Let us imagine the psychological impact of a proud, hard tanned Spartan boy contemplating an inferior ridiculously dressed, dancing awkwardly and singing incoherently. All this staging served for the Spartan boy to experience a good deal of disgust towards his enemies, who were taught to despise. In Sparta there was no vice of alcoholism, as a drunkard would had been fanatically pulp-beaten to the death as soon as spotted. It was Lycurgus himself who had ordered to weed the grapevines outside Sparta, and overall alcohol was something considered with utmost caution, distrust and control.

The lifestyle of the Spartan children would kill in less than a day the vast majority of adults of today. How did they endure? Simply because they had been bred for it. From an early age they were taught to be tough and strong, tanning in nature and neglecting the comforts of civilization. And the children’s bodies and spirits learned quickly and adapted easily to any situation, developing the qualities they needed to survive. Moreover, they were not allowed contact with anything that might soften them in the least, and so grew uncorrupted and uncontaminated.

As they grew, children discipline became tougher: puberty approached. Such transit in a society as close to its tribal roots as the Spartan must necessarily be accompanied by some kind of initiation ritual, probably in the brotherhoods to which they belonged. It is in adolescence when young people are initiated in their own incipient masculinity, and in Sparta they were prepared so that the advent of the male forces did not catch their innocent instincts by surprise. So, on the fly, and day to day, they were learning to become men without the chaotic physiological and mental imbalances currently rigged at arrival of adolescence.

The education of adolescents. We know with certainty that, at the gates of puberty, there was a brutal initiation ritual of physical and psychological type to be overcome in order to continue with the instruction. During the festival of the goddess Artemis, the altar was filled with tasty cheese. Aspiring lads had to steal as many cheeses as they could, but this must outwit a phalanx of armed lads with whips, instructed to use them unscrupulously in the task of protecting the altar. To achieve their objective, the boys must learn to coordinate and demonstrate a spirit of sacrifice and selflessness. Everyone received terrible wounds, but it was necessary to endure the pain as they stole the pieces. Sometimes a boy died. In Sparta there were many tests of this type, whose goal was to bring applicants to the limit to harden them up, also discarding the weak. Those who, covered in blood, bore the “ceremony” with no moan, cry pain or scream were awarded crowns of leaves and hailed as heroes for their people, acclaimed by their elders, young girls and the younger siblings, who found the triumph inspiring. Thus, the victorious became *eirenes* or *irenes* (ephebes).

From the moment following the festival of Artemis, a transformation operated in the instruction of the boys who had passed the test. They came from the gangs, receiving out a simple *himation* (woolen clothing) each year, being forbidden the *chiton* (common tunic). Discipline became stricter.

According to Xenophon, Lycurgus realized that, from adolescence, self-will is rooted in the mind of the boy. It looms in his conduct a subtle trend of insolence which marks the beginning of a selfish appetite and individualistic pleasure. Also, the stage that separates the fearful and innocent child from the wise veteran is a thin red line of imprudence and recklessness, typical of adolescence and those who, having learned a lot but not enough, tend to overestimate themselves and commit dangerous blunders. And that is the most difficult step in any learning: when you think you know “enough.”

To counter this potential pride, Spartan ephebes had to walk through the streets in silence, with their head bowed and their hands hidden, without looking around but fixing their eyes on the ground, taking a walk of monks, as centuries later would walk the perfect Manichean. Boys who would otherwise be the loudest and annoying were converted into gray and ghostly silhouettes. This, of course, was not permanent but temporary and contributed to strengthen the humility and modesty of the young Spartans; and to raise the pride of those who, after concluding their instruction, were allowed to walk with their heads held high. It also helped in the meantime that the citizens would not feel offended by the presumption of the candidates, since there is nothing to offend more a seasoned veteran than an arrogant and cocky “newbie” too proud of his achievements.

But on the other hand, the ephebes were first taught to read and write, and were taught music, dance, mythology and poetry. And, for the first time since they were seven years old, long hair was permitted: in which care they would rush, gradually getting spotless manes and feel pride of them, since the hair was “the cheapest ornament” and, according

to Lycurgus, “adds beauty to a beautiful face, and terror to an ugly face.” Wearing long hair was an ancient Greek custom that somehow recalled the barbarian origins of the race. Many have given long hair, especially in the case of women, the importance of signs of fertility: nervous system extensions and tuners of spiritual capacities. Archetypically, it is the manifestation of the spiritual bell that comes from the top head of the consummate practitioner of inner alchemy. On the formation of long hair act factors such as nutrition, health, exposure to sun and air, and exercise. Thus the mane should be something like a banner of individuality, a personal identification sign denoting the health and habits of the individual.

What is clear is that for some young people who had been at age seven with a shaved head, a grown hair should have represented a sign of psychological improvement, and convey the sense of a new, more spiritual stage, less helpless and raw, less brutal. After the painful stage in which children sacrificed their hair, they had conquered the beauty and individuality allowed to their perfect ancestors. Both the shaved head like the achievement of long hair were for the Spartans two stages of an archetypal transformation process, internal and external.

The most important new material of this period was the music, which was oriented to religious, patriotic and war hymns. The songs and the singing together is something that helps the united cultivation of the spirit and strengthen the cohesion of the collective unconscious. Each alliance of warriors always has had its songs. In Sparta there were numerous choirs, and every Spartan child should learn to sing in a chorus. In many ceremonies three groups were organized: one of old people, other of young males and another for children. When elders began singing “In the past we were young and brave and strong,” the young men continued “and so are we now, come and check it out for,” and the kids responded “but soon we will be the stronger.” A nation that prides itself always seeks that each generation is better than the previous as time goes on, like a wolf pack: the younger vigorous and impulsive generations replace the older in positions through direct action.

Great emphasis was placed in the cultivation of memory, and the young Spartans memorized ballads of the poet Tyrtaeus, who had helped them so much in the second Messenian war. As an example of the poetry of Tyrtaeus, forgive the following snippet:

Let's advance by locking a concave wall of shields, marching in rows of Pamphyli, Hylleis, Dymanes [the three originating Dorian tribes], and waving in the murderer hands the spears. Thus entrusting us to the Eternal Gods, without delay we comply with the orders of the captains, and we all right away go to the rude fray, firmly raising in front of those spearmen. Tremendous will be the crash when both armies collide their round shields and resonate when abut each other... Well, it's a beautiful die if you fall into that vanguard like brave warrior who fights for his country... with courage fight for the homeland and the children, and die without begrudging now our lives...

Those who dare, in closed row, to fight melee and advance in vanguard in fewer number die, and save those who follow them. Those who are left with nothing tremble without honor... Go in melee combat, with long spear or sword smite and finish with the fierce enemy. Putting foot by foot, squeezing shield to shield, plume with plume and helmet to helmet, chest to chest fight against the other, handling the hilt of the sword or the long spear... Go forward, children of the citizens of Sparta, the city of the brave warriors! With the left hold firm your shield, and the spear brandish boldly, without worrying to save your life: that is not the custom of Sparta. Make the spirit of your heart strong and courageous, and do not fall in love with life when you are fighting men.

The Spartan ephebes assiduously studied Homer, whose many verses could recite. But of course, the military-physical training did not stop ever, and was always the main subject. As they were getting older some boys were placed in front of the gangs of younger children, either as *paidonomos* or *mastigophora*. The desire of the veteran to make the rookie suffer to perfect him and cure him, teaching him everything he had learned—and that occurs in any army—, was taken to squeeze the new generations and to excel the foregoing.

We have seen that all instruction was intended to cultivate Spartan abilities as will to power, decision-making, the pleasure of responsibility, valor, courage, bravery, stoicism, patriotism, the martial, the ability of leadership, sobriety, self-control, asceticism, austerity, sacrifice and suffering, courage, physical and moral toughness, the sense of duty and honor, fortitude, wisdom, psychological and spiritual balance; the quick wit, sharp and cold and chivalry education, character building, solemnity, respect, brevity, iron discipline, efficiency, holy obedience and aggression. A wide range of important and basic qualities, today endangered. But all these qualities would be useless if they were not used for something; if they had no objective, a single goal. Nietzsche wrote, “It is inexcusable that, having power, you do not want to dominate.”

Any discipline, asceticism, self-control, the terrible pain, the fear, the danger, the risk, rivalry, hunger, thirst, sleepiness, exhaustion, cold, heat, discomfort, the hideous cruelty, the suffering and fighting, the beating, whipping, insults, blood splashing everywhere, the constant omnipresence of deeper death and higher life leading to a prodigious tension of life, were a wonderful and magnificent expression of how a whole lineage wanted to be: furious, and, at all costs, the absolute masters of their own collective will enthroned on Earth and mercilessly crushing any enemy that arose. Are these bad feelings? Or, conversely, are they highest and most admirable sentiments, sacred impulses that prompt to live, to fight, to destroy, to create, to renew and translate into some eternal memory? These were qualities and feelings that Indo-European humanity has lost and must be recovered.

All this is great as it is. Now then, what was the result of these qualities and these feelings? What was the result of such education? What was the result of the discipline of great suffering? The result was a man of superior type, with a cool head and insensitive to pain, suffering and discomfort, who used to think quickly in times of great danger and stress. A soldier well versed in all the arts of war who used to fight to achieve his goals; a martial man bred and trained to rule. A fearless and fearsome man, that despised his own life for the sake of his people; despised more the others, so he was hard and ruthless. A mighty stoic man also despised all material trifles of worldly life, and his only dedication were his brothers in combat, his loyalty to his country, and his devotion to his family and wishes of divinity for his race.

A man accustomed to outdoor life, which forged an unbreakable bond with his land, which was regarded as a sacred legacy, a responsibility. A gymnast with impressive physical form, a true athlete. A warrior used to earn things by himself. Nothing done to him would break him; he was able to endure the most terrible pains and deepest spiritual tragedies as calmly as accepting the joys and triumphs. After having demonstrated the ability to obey, he earned the right to command.

Think of how Spartan children suffered the pain, fear, stress and exhaustion. What happened when they emerged from childhood? Into what they turned when growing and becoming men? How would the body of an adult Spartan look like? We can only imagine, but at his side the young athletes of the Athenian sculptures may seem harmless angels.

The Spartan body was immediately distinguished for being very willowy, slender, dark-skinned not for race but for exposure to the sun, air, moisture; to dry, fresh and salt water, the skewers of vegetation, to stinging insects, dust, land, rock, snow, rain, hail and, ultimately, all kinds of weather. This would make the Spartan skin so stranded and hard as wood. Second, the relief of his body would be highlighted. The type of physical training had favored the development muscle mass concentration, hardness, strength, extreme flexibility and the “purging” of all grease and impurities. Thus, the Spartan would be fibrous and bulky at once, and would look lean and sharp. Vascular fat and softness would shine by their absence; blood vessels, ligaments, fibers, muscles, nerves and tendons would stand almost grotesquely and ultimately, everything would appear to be a rough, twisted, tense and compact mass of roots, branches, wires, tubes, cutting, marking and stones with the color of the wood.

In addition we can figure out that their body would be entirely crossed by many scars. The marks of the lashes would be remarkable in many areas of the skin, but especially in the back. Each Spartan should be a differential map, with different types of signs of violence. Many would lack teeth, have a broken nose and scars on the skull and face: a legacy of melee combats and brutal ball games. The height of the Spartan, what their contemporaries have told us (remember Xenophon, though he lived in an already decadent stage of Sparta), must be high if we consider the malnutrition undergoing in

childhood and puberty. In Thebes skeletons have been discovered belonging to a Spartan garrison, of which 180 centimeters must be a normal height among them. Spartan's hair was long, usually blond. They were allowed to grow beards and took pride in their care, because for them the beard was a symbol of a free and accomplished man who chooses his life. Their faces with a hard look, a strong expression highlighted by the intensely of the blue eyes bequeathed by their Dorian ancestors.

The animals are remarkable for their hardness, their instinct, their resistance to pain and hunger, bad weather, and for their ferocity. The Spartans, thanks to the energy that only comes with experience, motivation and a fanatical and methodical training, were able to beat them. Through self-sacrifice and the risk posed by blindly lunging the unknown and the extreme, they were able to answer the question of where the limits of man lay, and what man is capable when a supernatural will dwells within and take firm roots throughout his being.

We cannot even imagine how were the men of ancient times, for their ferocity, determination and toughness. Well, of them all, the Spartan was the hardest and well-made, the most perfected and stronger. The instruction of the Spartans was brutal, but in one way or another, instructors have always unconsciously intuited that that is the best way to form good warriors.

On a much smaller scale, modern armies also employ brutality toward the recruits. The insults, shouting, offences, humiliation, beatings and hazing—modern initiations—help the novice to be ashamed of his former self, to get rid of it, forget it and change it to a personality that is coupled with that of his comrades: another piece of the puzzle that will become his unit. Moreover, often they are not called by names, but by nicknames (“war names”) or numbers. Exhaustive exercises, inconvenience, discomfort, suffering, fear, stress, disgust, etc., serve to sustain and promote the recruit and his humility and respect before what excels him. Only when the applicant has *delivered himself* as a sacrifice, voluntarily touching bottom in strenuous suffering, he may start from scratch again in a new way, with a transformed personality purged of its blemishes and tempered in the fire and the hammer of an ideal; firm, fanatic, sublime and sacred. Today only the vaguest trace of all this stoicism has reached us.

Public punishments, extremely difficult testing, the victory of each gang and good sports scores helped to reinforce the prestige of the Spartan community. A community not only has prestige for those who do not belong to it, but its members feel that same prestige internally. This morality, this *esprit de corps*, increased the pride of belonging to such community. The sacrifices that Sparta members underwent made everyone feel pride and honor in their contemplation. Every time a lad calmly endured a whipping session, every time another one beat a sport record, each time that, with his face torn and bleeding hands, the victorious fighter triumphed over himself and over probability, the will of each member of the community was persuaded: “such acts demonstrate the greatness of my

community. I am proud to be with these men and will continue perfecting to reach their height.” And pride and elitism swelled as with fire. When called “equals” among each other, they felt mutually proud. And when a weak fell from exhaustion during a march, when another was punished for moaning in a fight or under the lashes, when another fainted of pain, when another did not return from the forest or mountain, when another died in a career or of hunger, the same iron will read these happenings: “Such acts show that not everyone has the honor of belonging to our community, but that it must be won. I want to win this honor and I am on track. And I want the weak to surrender, leave or be removed from our community for the sake of it.” That is, they dismissed those who might besmirch the honor of the word “equal,” and such removal was a sacrifice that kept alive the flame of pride.

This group is to the amorphous collectivity what the pack is for the flock.

Adult life

“To breed, to bleed, to lead.” —The law of the English aristocracy of old.

At age twenty, after thirteen years of an atrocious training that tanned their bodies for the rest of their lives, with scarred skin and crossed backs for the whipping, young Spartans reached the critical point in their lives. In case they did not successfully pass the final phase of instruction they became *perioeci* or *perioikoi*. The others were destined for a solemn ceremony in which the diverse military communities called Syssitias (which could be defined as communal meals, guilds or Army clubs), formed to recruit members among the recently promoted. The Syssitias had from fifteen to twenty members. Some had more prestige than others, and they tried to keep up their fame by recruiting the new “promotion.” Evaluating a candidate took into account his reputation, his toughness, his skill with weapons, his courage, his audacity, his presence, his fitness and intelligence.

The candidate presented himself in the table of the Syssitia he aspired to join. Syssitia members then deposited small pieces of bread in an urn. The contents of the urn were inspected, and if only one of the pieces had been deliberately flattened by one of the members, the candidate was rejected. Often it was the case that the best young, the most promising and famous, were disputed by several prestigious Syssitias, while the less remarkable were incorporated into the less demanding. In any case, it was rare that a young Spartan was denied entry to any Syssitia. But in the unlikely event of being rejected by all, the young man in question became *hypomeion* (inferior). An outcast who ate alone because of being rejected even by the most mediocre Syssitias implied that the candidate was undesirable for his comrades. He had the option to clean his honor through courageous deeds, or to fall in battle.

Joining a Syssitia meant that the member happened to be accepted by their peers as a Spartiate with all obligations, but would not acquire full citizenship rights until age thirty.

That is, after thirteen years of training and after entering the Army, there were still ten years of “probation” which coincided with the period of greatest biological flourishing.

Note that the criterion of the age of majority at twenty, and that other issues such as purity in matters of sex was shared by the Germans. Julius Caesar said about them in *Gallic Wars*:

From childhood they devote themselves to fatigue and hardships. Those who have remained chaste for the longest time receive the greatest commendation among their people. They think that, by doing this, growth is promoted... And to have had knowledge [sex] of a woman before the twentieth year they reckon among the most disgraceful acts. However, there is some hypocrisy in them in body issues, since men and women bath naked together in rivers and in their dresses so much of the body remains naked.

What is said here is exactly valid also for the Spartans who, as Indo-Europeans of tradition, drank from the same sources as the Germans. From an early age there was suffering, stimuli, glory and camaraderie to clear the path to manhood when it arrived, following *aidos* morale (“modesty,” “decency”). And even when maturity had arrived sexual abstinence was maintained until the young man was spiritually able to take control of his instincts. The end of all the preparatory stages was to accumulate energy and testosterone to grow; to complete without interference the biological alchemy that takes place in the male body during this stage.

In each Syssitia the member was required to provide food in the form of barley, wine, cheese, flour, figs, quinces and other fruits. If the member failed repeatedly to provide rations he was expelled from the Syssitia and degraded to *perioeci* or *hypomeion*. It was easy to get rations: they came from the parcel of land (*kleros*) that each soldier was assigned, a plot of land that he almost never saw; worked by helots, and managed by his wife. Throughout all the state Sparta had 10,000 parcels of which about 6,000 were in the territories of conquered Messenia.

At age of twenty, therefore, after having entered these military Syssitias, young soldiers were incorporated in the Spartan phalanx. They would be part of it, if they survived, until their sixty years: gradually ascending the ladder of command, merit and experience. They would spend most of their lives committed to the Army, although their operational period would be ten years, between twenty and thirty. From thirty they were allowed to live at home with their wives and perform public tasks to become citizens and enter the Assembly. Until then, they lived in military barracks and made all their meals with their Syssitia fellows. When they had free time they supervised the instruction of the younger generation and tried to teach them useful things, encourage them for the fights to discover the capabilities of each child, and maybe even learn something from them occasionally.

Other times they were given to the company of their elders to learn from them something useful, or to hear their stories and their reflections.

The Syssitias were very important institutions in Sparta, for when the men were not waging war, they were training for warring better. And if not, they socialized with their comrades in these “clubs.” Only as a fourth place were family relationships ranked. The Syssitias were presided over by a statue of the god of laughter, introduced by the same Lycurgus. There the Spartan developed his humor and his sharp and terse conversations. There, men of every age and condition mingled. It was impossible, thus, the emergence of the “generation gap” since all generations shared their experiences and concerns. There were no distinctions of wealth, only of valor itself, and the experience was taken into account when assessing a man. They were united by the fact of having passed the instruction, having had similar hardships, and being male Spartans. They were proud to be joining the phalanx alongside those who had amply demonstrated their toughness, bravery and righteousness. That was what made them brothers.

It was of immense importance that each Spartan contracted marriage and had many children, and in fact they imposed fines and penalties for late marriage and there was even a tax of bachelorhood. As for celibacy, it was a clear crime in Sparta, and it was not even conceived. They were occasions of groups of girls beating up wandering bachelor men of already certain age. Other witnesses recounted how in winter single males and females and even couples without children were stripped naked and forced to march through the city center singing a song about how fair it was their humiliation, because they had failed to fulfill the law.

Being single at a certain age—around twenty-five—was a disgrace comparable to cowardice in battle, since Spartan femininity was completely healthy, pure and trained to provide exemplary wives and proud mothers. These women were perfectly at the height of a Spartan. Under the natural viewpoint prevailed in Sparta, it was a crime that existing perfectly healthy girls a lad deprived the race of offspring. Plutarch tells a revealing anecdote about it. A famous and respected Spartan general called Dercyllidas came at a meeting and one of the young Spartans refused to relinquish his seat, as he should, “because you do not leave a child that would relinquish it [the seat] to me.” The young man was not reprimanded or punished, because he was right.

High rates of birth were favored through incentives and awards to large families, plus the releasing of communal pay of those who had more than four healthy children. This, along with the practical obligation to marry, was aimed at encouraging the multiplication of the race.

The same occurred in the Nazi SS, where we can see how they tried by all means to multiply the progeny. Like the Spartans, the SS favored the high birth rate among its members, punishing those who did not reproduce. Some single officers were even

threatened with expulsion, and were given a year to get married. In other cases, when a fighter of the SS had lost all his brothers, he was often allowed a leave period to ensure a large family before returning to the front. The alleged reason was that the State was interested that his blood would not be lost for the future. This policy healed the previous genocide of countless chaste, good men in medieval Europe: particularly the members of military-religious orders such as the Templars. Both the Spartans and the SS were a *sippenorden*, i.e., a racial order or religious-military order: racial clans who wanted to be eternal on earth; materially eternalized through their children and their descendants.

We gather, in any case, that the Spartan population growth should not be as great as many imagine, because despite its abundant children many died in eugenic selection and childrearing, and others during the instruction or infectious diseases expected by natural selection.

With respect to the superfluous, the Spartan philosophy was: “If it is not essential, it is a hindrance.” Everything that was not necessary for survival was banished with disdain. The jewels, ornaments, extravagant designs, garish colors and other burdens and distractions, were excised from Sparta. The luxury and decor were nonexistent. To the Spartans it was strictly forbidden to trade with gold or silver, and the possession of it was severely punished, as well as the use as ornaments or jewelry.

The Spartan state itself refused to make coins of any kind. As tool for exchange of goods (that is, money), iron bars were used (Laconia had important iron mines). They were so big, ugly and heavy that few people wanted to accumulate them, hide them, or possess them (we could add also to count them, pet them and watch over them with curiosity as did the greedy with the beautiful gold coins). Moreover, the bars were not accepted outside of Sparta. Plutarch says, referring to the Spartan “currency” that “no one could buy with it foreign effects, nor it entered the trading ports, nor reached Laconia any wordy sophist, greeter or swindler, or man of bad traffic of women or artificer of gold and silver” (*Life of Lycurgus*, IX).

In short, it was not easy to fiddle with this money; nor deal, bribe, steal, smuggle or enter into contracts with foreigners; nor could vices appear such as gambling or prostitution. The greedy was exposed, as it needed a barn to store his entire fortune. And if someone happened to cut the handle bars and hide them, the manufacturers of these—when it was red-hot—dipped in vinegar, which made it lose ductility and could not be worked or molded.

I cannot resist noting that the use of iron as money in Sparta is archetypal and symbolic. While other states abandoned themselves in the gold, Sparta adopted the rough metal. While other, softer states often aimed at recreating the golden age in its nostalgic narcosis, Sparta adapted itself to the hard times of the Iron Age. Sparta, really, was a true daughter of the Iron Age: a jewel among ferments of decomposition of the autumn evening light. It

was in Sparta where the understanding of a type of superior wisdom was kept: not the golden and regressed and senile wisdom, but the new wisdom of iron.

Thanks to all the measures of sobriety, coarseness and austerity, Sparta escaped the cosmopolitan, false soothsayers, jewelers, merchants, liars, drug dealers and other eastern specimens, who refused to go through a state where there was virtually no money; the little that existed was an unwanted burden to his owner, and its inhabitants were all proud, xenophobic and incorruptible soldiers.

Plutarch said that for the Spartans “money lacked interest or appreciation.” Both the contempt of material and fleeting pleasures like money itself points to an ascetic, anti-materialist and anti-hedonistic society. Nietzsche repeated, like other Eastern teachers: “Whoever has little is in no danger that he will be owned. Praise that simple poverty!” The Spartans were taught that civilization itself, with its luxuries, comforts, riches, its effeminacy, lust and complacency, was a dilutional factor: something countless times certificated by Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, who admired the ascendant and uncontaminated world of the barbarians, of which the Spartans were the ultimate, more refined and perfected expression. Sparta did not have to be contaminated by this dangerous Eastern influence, first because it had the abundant labor of the helots and because, for racial reasons, it did not allow immigration and the slave trade. Sparta saw itself as the repository of ancient Greek, and especially, Dorian customs and thus they also saw the other people of Hellas—except Athens.

From age twenty-five Spartans were allowed to eat with their wives, occasionally. From age thirty (the age at which the growth hormone decays) Spartan discipline relaxed, especially on the “communal” aspects. The Spartan left, then, the military barracks and went to live in his home with his wife and children (though by now probably some of his sons would be suffering under state supervision and instruction). They joined the Assembly, a popular organism to be discussed later, performing any duty of the state, a responsibility assigned to him: like army commanders, *harmost* (military governors) among the *perioeci*, envoys from Sparta abroad, etc. They passed, then, to be citizens with all the rights and all the duties.

At sixty years old, if he came to that age and if he had the honor of being selected, the Spartan became part of the Senate. Being senator was for life. Spartan old age enjoyed immeasurable respect from the countrymen, who unconditionally revered their elders as repositories of wisdom and experience, and as a link connecting the past with the present, just as the youth is the bond that unites the present with the future. The Spartans revered the elders even if they were not Spartans. As an example of the latter we have a story that happened in the theater of Athens while some Spartan ambassadors were inside. An old man entered the theater and no Athenian rose to cede the seat, acting as if they didn't know. However, upon arrival at their place of honor all the Spartan ambassadors rose in unison to cede the place. And then the Athenian audience applauded the noble gesture.

“All Greeks know good manners,” said one of the ambassadors, “but only the Spartans behave in accordance with them” (*Life of Lycurgus*, IX).

Women and marriage

“Man shall be trained for war, and woman for the recreation of the warrior: all else is folly.” —Nietzsche

So far we have examined in detail the Spartan man. It is time to consider the woman and to direct our attention towards her. The Spartans were perhaps the clearest representation of women of honor in the Iron Age, raised under a system that brought out their best qualities. But is it a paradox that, under a resounding patriarchy, women might enjoy broad freedoms? Is it nonsense that in a military where women should have nothing to do, they had more rights than women in any other Greek state? The German ideologue Alfred Rosenberg wrote:

Sparta offered the example of a well disciplined state, and was devoid of any female influence. The kings and the ephors formed the absolute power, the essence of which was the maintenance and expansion of this power through the increase of the Dorian upper stratum with its disciplined outlook.

The Indo-Europeans were strongly patriarchal nations, whose most representative word was precisely “fatherland,” in Latin *patria* (father). In Germanic languages—German *Vaterland* and *fatherland* in English—the words mean “land of the fathers.” Sparta itself was patriarchal to the core, but as we shall see, the Spartans were not in any way unfair or oppressive to their wives. They enjoyed an impossible freedom in the effeminate societies where everything is focused on materialism and enjoyment of earthly, temporary pleasures, when the woman becomes an *betaerae*: a passive object of enjoyment and distorted worship.

Sparta, a state so hard and so manly, was the fairest of Hellas in everything concerning their women, and not for mollicoddling, spoiling or flattering them. Sparta was the only Greek state which instituted a policy of female education, outside the knowledge of the home and children that every woman should own. Sparta was also the state with the highest literacy rate of all Hellas, because Spartan girls were taught to read like their brothers, unlike the rest of Greece where women were illiterate.

In the rest of Greece, sometimes, newborn girls (remember the myth of Atalanta), even if they were perfectly healthy (just like in China today) were exposed to death. Many parents almost considered a disgrace the birth of a girl, and finally all that was achieved was to produce an imbalance in the demographic distribution of the sexes.

But Sparta had more women than men, because their exposure of girls was not as severe; because girls did not pass the brutalities of male instruction, because they did not fall in battle, and because men were often on campaign. Spartans who felt at home should, therefore, always thought in terms of mothers, sisters, wives and daughters: the Homeland, the sacred ideal, had a female character; and protecting it amounted to protect their women. Men did not protect themselves: they were the remote shell of the heart, the sacred heart, and sacrificed themselves in honor of that heart. In Sparta more than anywhere else, females made up the inner circle, while males represented the protective outer wall.

Spartan girls received food in the same amount and quality of their brothers, which did not happen in the democratic states of Greece, where the best food pieces were for boys. Spartan girls were placed under an education system similar to the boys that favored their skills of strength, health, agility and toughness in outdoor classes, but trained by women. And they were not educated in that blind fanaticism inculcated to excel, sacrifice and desire—that feeling that among boys brushed the desire for self-destruction. For girls, on the other hand, the emphasis was put in the domain and control of emotions and feelings and the cultivation of the maternal instinct. It favored that youths of both sexes trained athletically together, as it was expected that the lads would encourage the fair sex to excel in physical exertion.

The hardness, severity and discipline of female education were, in any case, much lower than those of the *Agoge*, and there was much less emphasis on the domain of the suffering and pain as well as aggression. Punishment for Spartan girls was not even remotely as cruel as the punishment for boys, nor were torn out from their family homes at seven. After seeing the almost supernatural prowess that meant male instruction, the education of girls, despite being exemplary, is nor impressive.

But why was all this about, apart from the fact that all men were active in the military and therefore needed more self-control and discipline? Simply put, the man is a ticking time bomb. In his insides it ferments and burns all kinds of energies and essences that, if not channeled, are negative when poured out as these forces come from the “dark side” which first inclination is chaos and destruction. The aggressiveness of man, his instinct to kill, his tendency to subdue others, his sexual boost, greatest strength, courage, power, will, strength and toughness, make that he has to be subjected to a special discipline that cultivates and channels those energies in order to achieve great things, especially when it comes to young healthy men with powerful, natural instincts—under penalty of which his spirits suffer a huge risk.

Asceticism itself (as sacrifice) is much more typical of man than woman. In fact, the Indo-European woman was never subjected to disciplinary systems as severe as those of the ancient armies. She was considered by the men of old as a more “magical” creature because she was not hindered by the roars of the beast within. For all these reasons, it was

fair that the male education was more severe and rigorous than the female: that is how you train the beast. “It is better to educate men,” Nietzsche put in the words of a wise man who suggested disciplining women.

The main thing in the female formation was physical and a “socialist” education to devote their lives to their country—like men, only that in their case the duty was not shedding her blood on the battlefield, but to keep alive the home, providing a strong and healthy offspring to her race, and raise them with wisdom and care. Giving birth is the fruit of the female instinct that renews the race: that was the mission inculcated in the girls of Sparta.

Spartan women ran, boxed and wrestled in addition of using javelin and disc. They swam, did gymnastics and danced. Although they did participate in sport tournaments, women were barred from the Olympics because of the rejection of the other Hellenic peoples, infected with the mentality whereby a “lady” should rot within four walls. We see that, while Greek sculptures represent well the ideal of male beauty (think of the *Discobolus* by Myron), they did not in the least approach the ideal of Aryan female beauty: all women in female statues represented amorphous, not very natural, non-athletic bodies albeit with perfect facial features. If the Spartans had left sculptures of women, they would have represented better the ideal of beauty because they, unlike the other Greeks, had a clearly defined feminine ideal: it was clear what a woman had to be.

As for female austerity, it was pronounced (though not as much as the one that men practiced), especially compared with the behavior of the other Greek women, so fond of the colors, superficiality, decorations, objects, and with a hint of “consumerism” typical of civilized societies. Spartan women did not even know the extravagant hairstyles from the East and they wore, as a sign of their discipline, their hair up with simplicity: probably the most practical for a life of intense sports and activity. Also, all kinds of makeup, decorations, jewelry and perfumes were unknown and unnecessary for Spartan women, which proudly banished all that southern paraphernalia. Seneca said that “virtue does not need ornaments; it has in itself its highest ornaments.”

One purpose of raising healthy and agile women was that Spartan babies, growing within solid bodies, were born as promising products. According to Plutarch, Lycurgus “made the maidens exercise their bodies in running, wrestling, casting the discus, and hurling the javelin, in order that the fruit of their wombs might have vigorous root in vigorous bodies and come to better maturity, and that they themselves might come with vigour to the fullness of their times, and struggle successfully and easily with the pangs of child-birth” (*Life of Lycurgus*, XIV).

Spartan women were prepared, since childhood, to childbirth and to the stage where they would be mothers, teaching them the right way to raise the little one to become a true Spartan. During this training, the Spartan women were often babysitters, acquiring experience for times when they would receive the initiation of motherhood. They married

from age twenty, and did not marry men who surpassed them greatly in age (as in the rest of Greece), but with men their age or five years older or younger at most. Age difference within the members of a marriage was poorly viewed, as it sabotaged the duration of the couple's fertile phase. The aberration of marrying girls of fifteen with men of thirty was not even remotely allowed, an aberration that did happen in other Hellenic states where parents came to force unions whose age difference was of a generation.

Nor was allowed in Sparta another abomination, which consisted of marrying girls with their own uncles or cousins to keep inherited wealth within the family: an altogether oriental, anti-Indo-European and unnatural mentality. Other practices, such as prostitution or rape, were not even conceived. Or adultery. One Geradas, a Spartan of very ancient type, who, on being asked by a stranger what the punishment for adulterers was among them, answered: "Stranger, there is no adulterer among us." "Suppose, then," replied the stranger, "there should be one." "A bull," said Geradas, "would be his forfeit, a bull so large that it could stretch over Mount Taygetus and drink from the river Eurotas." Then the stranger was astonished and said: "But how could there be a bull so large?" To which Geradas replied, with a smile: "But how could there be an adulterer in Sparta?"

Such, then, are the accounts we find of their marriages.

In other Greek states, male nudity was common in religious and sport activities, and this was a sign of their arrogance and pride. Female nudity, however, was banned as the very presence of women in such acts. But in the processions, religious ceremonies, parties and sport activities of Sparta, girls were as naked as the young. Every year during the Gymnopaedia, which lasted ten days, the Spartan youth of both sexes competed in sports tournaments and danced naked. (This was another suggestion of Plato in his *Republic* as well as one of the observations made by Caesar on the Germans.) It was felt that, attending sporting events, the young Spartan would be able to select a well-built husband.

Today nudist activities of this type would be ridiculous because people's nudity is shameful; modern bodies are flabby and lack normal forms. The modern individual tends to see an athletic body as an outstanding body, when an athletic body is a normal and natural body; it is the rest, non-exercised types which are not normal. Recall Nietzsche's reflection: "A naked man is generally regarded as a shameful spectacle." However, at that time, witnessing such a display of health, agility, strength, beauty, muscle and good constitutions should inspire genuine respect and pride of race. The Hellenes of the democratic states argued at the time that the presence of female nudity could cause leering looks, but the fact is that the Spartans took it all with ease and pagan nonchalance. Moreover, young Spartan women that identified an awestruck voyeur used a clever string of jokes that made him a fool in front of the entire stadium, full of solemn authorities and attentive people.

In some ceremonies, the girls sang about boys who had done great deeds, or dishonored that had led to bad. They were, in some way, the demanding voice of the Spartan collective unconscious, which ensures the courage and conduct of men. Not only in the songs appeared the pouring of their opinions, but in public life: they did not overlook a single one; they were not gentle, but were always criticizing or praising the brave and coward. For men of honor, opinions on the value and manhood were more important if they came from female voices worthy of respect: the criticisms were sharper and praises more restorative. According to Plutarch, the Spartan woman “engendered in young people a laudable ambition and emulation.” That is why relationships with women not softened them, but hardened them even more, as they preferred to be brave and conquer their worship.

And what was the result of the patriarchal education on the young girls? It was a caste of women on the verge of perfection: severe, discreet and proud. Spartan femininity took the appearance of young athletic, happy and free, yet serious and somber. They were, as the Valkyries, perfect companion of the warriors. Trophy-women insofar as they aspired for the best man, but physically active and bold; very far, then, from the ideal of “woman-object.”

In all Hellas, Spartan women were known for their great beauty and respected for their serenity and maturity. The poet Alcman of Sparta (7th century BCE) dedicated a poem to a woman champion competing in chariot races, praising her for her “golden hair and silver face.” Two centuries later, another poet, Bacchylides, wrote about the “blonde Lacedaemonian,” describing her “golden hair.” Given that the dyes in Sparta were banned, we can deduce that racism and the Apartheid instinct of the Spartans with respect to aboriginal Greeks was strong enough so that, no more and no less than seven centuries after the Dorian invasion, blond hair still predominated among the citizenry of the country.

In a comedy called *Lysistrata*, written by the Athenian playwright Aristophanes (444-385 BCE), there is a scene where a crowd of admiring Athenian women surround a young Spartan named Lampito. “What a splendid creature!” they said. “What a skin, so healthy, what a body, so firm!” Another added: “I’ve never a chest like that.” Homer called Sparta *Kalligynaika*, meaning “land of beautiful women.” On the other hand, do not forget that the legendary Helen of Troy, the most beautiful woman in the world, was originally Helen of Sparta: an ideal that was stolen by the East and that not only Sparta, but the whole Greece recovered through fighting and conquest.³¹

³¹ The very image of Helen of Sparta has to be purified. Far from the common vision that Hollywood has shown us, her spirit became disordered by the outburst of Aphrodite. Helen, the highest ideal of Hellenic beauty and femininity, was kidnapped by the East, hence the remarkable swat of the Greeks. Upon her arrival in Troy, Helen recovered memory, recalled she was the queen of Sparta, married to King Menelaus and that they had two daughters; and bitterly regretted and wept for her mistake.

Spartan women were superior in all respects to the other women of their time and, of course, today's women. Even in physical virtues, courage and toughness they would outstrip most modern men. Their severity was the best company to their husbands and the best raising for their children, and she demanded the greatest sacrifices. An anecdote recounts how a Spartan mother killed his own son when she saw he was the sole survivor of the battle and that returned home with a back injury, that is, he had fled rather than fulfill his sacred duty: immolation. Another Spartan mother, seeing her son fled the combat, lifted her robe and asked in the most merciless crudeness if his intention was to, terrified, return from where he came. While other mothers would have said "poor thing!" and stretched their arms open, Spartan mothers did not forgive.

Tacitus wrote that the mothers and wives of the Germans (whose mentality was not too different from the Spartan) used to count the scars of their warriors, and that they even required them to return with wounds to show their readiness of sacrifice for them. The Spartans believed that in their wives lived a divine gift, and it was not to be the women who would convince them otherwise, so these women sought to maintain the high standard of the devotion their men professed.

Furthermore, women were convinced that in their men lived the nobility, courage, honesty, power and righteousness typically of the male, along with the notion of duty, honor and the willingness to sacrifice; and men also sought to keep up with such an ideal. Again, we find that the ancient woman did not soften the man, but helped to improve and perfect him because the man felt the need to maintain the integrity before such women; so women remained alert and they did the same with them, having in their minds that they themselves were ideals for which their men were willing to sacrifice themselves. Thus, a virtuous circle was created. The woman was a motif not to give up the fight, but precisely a reason to fight with even more fanaticism.

Other Greeks were outraged because the Spartan women were not afraid to speak in public; because they had opinions and, what is more, their husbands listened. (The same indignation the Romans experienced about the greater freedom of Germanic women.)

Helen cursed her luck and Aphrodite by her deception, she considered herself captive despite being treated like a princess, and despised her "husband" Paris (as is evident when she contemptuously rejects him after having behaved like a coward before Menelaus, for whom she reserved her admiration). Lamenting her fate, she wished to be recovered by her lawful husband, as attested by the scene where she has her window in form of open arms as to communicate the permanence of her love. Once she was recovered for Greece, Helen returned to the Spartan throne with honors, serving as queen again, as seen in the *Odyssey* when Telemachus, son of Odysseus, goes to Sparta to inquire about the fate of his father. It is then that Penelope, wife of Odysseus and mother of Telemachus, laments that her son goes to Sparta, "the land of beautiful women."

Moreover, since their men were in constant military camp life, Spartan women, like the Vikings, were responsible for the farm and home. They managed the home resources, economy and self-sufficiency of the family, so that the Spartans relied on their wives to provide the stipulated food rations for their Syssitias. Spartan women (again, like Germanic women) could inherit property and pass it, unlike the other Greek women. All this female domestic administration was, as we see, similar in Germanic law, where women boasted the home-key as a sign of sovereignty over the holy and impregnable family house, and of faithfulness to the breadwinner. Home is the smallest temple that may have the smallest unit of blood, the cell on which the whole race is based: the family. And the bearer of the key had to be forcibly the mother.

A society at war is doomed if the home, if the female rear, is not with the male vanguard. All the sacrifices of the warriors are just a glorious waste, aimless and meaningless if in the country no women are willing to keep the home running, providing support and spiritual encouragement to the men in the field and, ultimately, giving birth to new warriors. A soldier far from home, without country, ideal and a feminine image of reference—a model of perfection, an axis of divinity—immediately degenerates into a villain without honor. Conversely, if he is able to internalize an inner mystique and a feminine symbolism that balances the brutality he witness day after day, his spirit will be strengthened and his character ennoble. Sparta had no problems in this regard; Spartan women were the perfect counterpart of a good warrior.

Even marriage was tinged with violence. During the ceremony, the man, armed and naked, grabbed her arm firmly and brought the girl “by force” as she lowered her head. (According to Nietzsche, “The distinctive character of a man is will; and in a woman, submission.” In Spartan marriage this was truer than anywhere else.) This should not be interpreted in a literal sense of rapture, but in a metaphorical sense and ritual: a staging of Indo-European mythologies are numerous with references of robbery, kidnapping—and the subsequent liberation—of something holy that is necessary to win, earn the right to own it. The fire from the gods, the golden fleece, the apples of the Hesperides, the grail of Celtic and Germanic traditions and the sleeping Valkyrie are examples of such sacred images. Cherished ideals not to be delivered free but conquered by force and courage after overcoming difficult obstacles, and thus ensured that only the most courageous were able to snatch it and own it, while the weak and timid were disqualified in the fight.

On the other hand, can we not find a similarity between the Spartan marriage ritual and the Indo-Iranian *sveyamvara* marriage by abduction allowed to warriors, and in the case of the Sabine abducted by Latins in the origins of Rome, and the same type of marriage allowed to the old Cossacks? In the Indo-Aryan writing, the *Mahabharata*, we read how the hero Arjuna abducted Subhadra “as do the warriors,” marrying her. Again, it was not a literal rapture but rather the conquest of the sacred through respect and strength what rendered the sacred fall before the hero.

In Spartan marriage, then, we see how the Spartan woman was elevated to the status of a divine ideal and not given by her parents to a man chosen by them (as in other rituals of marriage, which makes the bride an object of barter), but the brave man had to earn her. In fact, in Sparta it was not allowed that parents had anything to do with the marital affairs of their offspring; it was the couple that decided their marriage, allowing that preferences and the healthy instincts of the youths would be unhindered—making it clear that to possess a woman of the category of the Spartan it was not enough wealth, parental consent, marriage arrangements, dialectics, seduction or false words. It was necessary to make an overwhelming impression; be robust and noble and genetically worthy.

Also, the Spartan marriage ceremony—dark and almost sinister in its direct crudeness—is the height of the patriarchal warrior society, and one of the most eloquent expressions of patriarchy that governed in Sparta. Lycurgus sought to establish military paranoia and a perpetual environment of war even in marriage. Just as children had to procure their food by hunting and gathering and rapine and pretending to be in the enemy zone, an adult man should also win his chosen one by pretending to be into fringe, hostile territory—“abducting her” in remembrance of a hard and dangerous time that was not kind for romance and lovers. This again made evident how little parents were involved in a plot like this: in ancient times, if they refused to consent to the marriage, the young man performed a daring raid and, with the complicity of his fiancée, “abducted her.”

With the Spartan marriage system it was also subtly implied that, as Nature teaches, not everyone was entitled to a female. To be eligible for this right it was necessary for a man to pass a test: eugenics, child rearing, education, entry into the Army Syssitias and the mutual fidelity of a young female belonging to the same call-up year, which in turn he gained through observation and knowledge at sporting events, popular and religious, and a long loving friendship whose latent purpose should remain hidden from the rest of society. Throughout all these phases the man conquered his beloved girl. The unconquered woman had to prove nothing. She chose her fiancé and had the say as to accept her future husband. Ultimately, it was she who willingly indulged in complicity, leaving herself to be ritually “kidnapped” by the man of her choice.

After the ritual, the bride was taken to the house of her in-laws. There they shaved her head and made her wear clothing like a man. Then she was left in a dark room, waiting for the arrival of the groom. All this is extremely difficult to understand for a modern Western mind and it is not from this point of view we should try to understand it, but putting us at the time and bearing in mind that both Spartan man and woman belonged to an Order.

This last—totally sordid—phase served to impress upon the newlyweds the notion that the secrecy and discretion of their relationship was not over, and that they had not yet earned the right to enjoy a normal marriage. For the woman it implied initiation, sacrifice and a new stage. She was stripped from her seduction skills and her awareness of being

attractive. For the man, it was beneficial to make him appreciate what really mattered of his wife: not clothes, hair or ornaments but her body; her face and character.

Consuming an act in these gloomy conditions and absolutely hostile to romance and sexual arousal was for both the man and the woman the least imaginable stimulating, so that gradually they became accustomed to the physical sensations arising from the sexual act, but without the additional psychological stimuli such as a more feminine look in the woman and a gentler environment—stimuli that tend to boycott male stamina, moving him to abandon himself to pleasure and rest on his laurels. Therefore, this staging was not much inspiring sexually in short term, but instead was very stimulating in long-term in a subtle way: slowly, it was blown into the hearts of the lovers the longing for that which was not still allowed.

So, by the time a woman had re-grown abundant hair, and the pseudo-clandestineness of the relationship was dissipated over time, both male and female were well experienced adults who knew what they wanted and, despite it, had not suffered any loss in sexual desire but rather were more than ever prepared to appreciate and enjoy what meant a free physical relationship.

Lycurgus established that a man should be ashamed to be seen with his wife in loving attitudes so that the meeting took place in private and with greater intimacy and passion, and that the surrounding secrecy and hostility favored the magic of the union: the feeling of complicity and the true romance, which always has to have some secrets. (Plato said that holding hands and fondling should be the maximum carnal love shown in public.) The objective of this measure, too, was to promote mutual thirst for true knowledge, fascination, mystery, magic: the sacred short-circuit between man and woman, and—let's say it—the curiosity of the forbidden, so that their relationship had no public at all, but a private matter, and to encourage that a man and a woman would not get tired of one another. The Spartan couple should have, then, a powerful sexuality that oozed from healthy bodies and pure spirits, resulting in a clean eroticism and a positive lust necessary for the preservation of the race. In the words of Xenophon:

He [Lycurgus] noticed, too, that, during the time immediately succeeding marriage, it was usual elsewhere for the husband to have unlimited intercourse with his wife. The rule that he adopted was the opposite of this: for he laid it down that the husband should be ashamed to be seen entering his wife's room or leaving it. With this restriction on intercourse the desire of the one for the other must necessarily be increased, and their offspring was bound to be more vigorous than if they were surfeited with one another [*Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, 1].

How, then, did the Spartans manage to be with their wives? In the Syssitias, a man stood quietly and left the room, ensuring that nobody saw him (at night it was forbidden to walk with a lighting of any kind, to promote the ability to move in the dark without fear and

safely). He entered his home, where he found his wife and where happened what had to happen. The man then returned to the Syssitia with his comrades in arms, wrapped in a secrecy that almost touched the squalor. Nobody noticed anything. The sexuality of the couple was strictly private, even furtive and pseudo-clandestine so that no person would interfere with it and make the relationship stronger and, to quote again Plutarch, that their minds were always “recent in love, to leave in both the flame of desire and complacency.”

Were Spartan relations normal, natural or desirable? No. Quite the opposite. They created a most unpleasant weather, far from corresponding to some sort of “ideal.” No sane person would want such a relationship as a way of seeking pleasure. For the Spartans, however, as a result of their peculiar idiosyncrasies, it “worked.” And yet, we see that boredom, repetition, lack of curiosity and monotony, the real demons in modern couples (and not an infrequent cause of dissatisfaction, infidelity, breakups or perversions that emerge when breaking the routine) were uncommon in Spartan marriages.

Spartan privacy and discretion were, in fact, the opposite of the relations of our days: pure appearance and social desirability with a public, not private basis. Spartans understood this important issue and lived in conformity with it. They favored the meeting of men and women in popular events, but they kept loving relationships strictly private. (Millennia later, the SS also understood it, and on their tables of values they firmly stamped: “Maintain the mysterious appearance of love!”) The strength of their love came from themselves, unlike the infantile current relationships whose fuel is the external world outside the couple, without which the couple is empty and cannot function.

Spartan Romanticism was the epitome of love in the Iron Age: love in a hostile area and in difficult times. Marriage relationships were designed for the exchange to be beneficial. Today, the marriage almost invariably castrates man, making him fat, cowardly, lazy, and turning the woman into a manipulative, hedonistic, whimsical and poisonous individual.

On the other hand, there was another controversial Spartan measure that had to do with the need to procreate. If a man began to grow old and knew a young man whose qualities admired, he could present him to his wife to beget robust offspring. The woman could cohabit with another man who accepted her, if he was of greater genetic value than her husband (i.e., if he was a better man). This was not considered adultery but a service to the race. Also, if a woman was barren or began to decline biologically, the husband was entitled to take a fertile woman who loved him, and he was not considered an adulterer. In Viking society (the kind of society that came from the ancient Dorians) if a woman was unfaithful with a man manifestly better than her husband, it was not considered adultery.

The above may seem sordid and primitive; it may seem an annulment of the individual or of the order, and “reduce a man to the status of cattle,” but with the strong desire of offspring in Sparta they cared little about selfish or individual desires. To the forces of Nature and race personal whims are unimportant; what matters is that the offspring are

healthy and robust, and that the torrent of children is never extinguished. These peculiar measures, that in an undisciplined people would have provoked chaos, in the Spartans, used to discretion and order, did not cause any problems. On the other hand, we must avoid falling into the trap of thinking that all couples “got laid.” In the majority of cases both partners were healthy and fertile and did not need of any “assistance.”

What was considered the birth in Sparta in the context of this natural mindset? A good way to explain it is quoting an Italian Fascist slogan, “War is to the male what childbearing is to the female.” The duty of man was sacrificing his strength from day to day and shed his blood on the battlefield, and women’s to struggle to give birth and raise healthy children. Since their childhood that was the sacred duty they had been taught.

In this environment, a Spartan woman who refused to give birth would have been as unpopular as a Spartan man who refused to fight, for the woman who refuses to give birth sabotaged the sacrifice of the young warrior just as the man who refuses to defend home sabotaged the efforts of the young mother who gives birth. It would have been more than a sacrilege: a betrayal. Artemis, the most revered female deity in Sparta, was, among other things, the goddess of childbirth, and was invoked when the young women were giving birth. In any case, labor for Spartan women should not have been traumatic, first because since their childhood their bodies were hardened and they exercised the muscles that would help them give birth; secondly because they conceived their children while they were still young and strong, and thirdly because they gave birth under a happy and proud motivation of duty, aided by a knowledge and a natural medicine confirmed by many generations of mothers and Spartan nurses.

The great freedom of women in Sparta did not imply that women were handed over leadership or positions of power. The woman was not the driving, but the inspiring, generating and conservative force. She did not dominate but subtly influenced, strangely reaffirming the character of men. A woman could be a priestess or a queen, but not meddled in the affairs of political and warrior leadership, because that meant taking a role associated with the masculine side. The woman was a pure ideal that must at all costs be kept away from the dirty side of politics and war command, but always present in society and in the thought of the warrior, because that was where resided her mysterious power. It was in the mind of men where the woman became a conductive force, meaning memory-love (in terms of Minni) and inspiration.

To Gorgo, queen of Sparta, wife of king Leonidas, a foreign woman once said that only Spartan women kept any real influence over men, and the queen answered, “because we are the only ones who give birth to real men.” Again, they had influence over men, but not power. In ancient Scandinavian meetings, as an example of the value of the feminine influence, only married men were allowed to vote. The man was the one who made the decisions, but it was assumed that he was not complete until he had at his side a complementary, feminine spirit, a Woman who could transmit certain magic everyday, and

inspired him with her reflections and only then he was allowed to vote. In practice, every marriage was a single vote. On the other hand, in the other Hellenic states the female presence was banished, thus unbalancing the mentality and behavior of the warrior, and finally facilitating the emergence of pederast homosexuality. The whole issue of Spartan femininity was really inconceivable in the rest of Greece.



The Athenians called the Spartan women *fainomérides* (“those that show the thighs”) as a reproach of their freedom of dress. This was because the Spartans were still using the old Dorian *peplos*, which was open in the waist side. It was part of a women’s fashion, more comfortable and lighter than the female clothing in the rest of Greece: where fashions flourished of extravagant hairstyles, makeup, jewelry or perfumes. It was a fashion for healthy Spartan women. But the rest of Hellas, as far as women are concerned, was already infected with Eastern customs: which kept them permanently locked up at home; where their bodies weakened and sick minds developed. The Athenian poet Euripides (480-406 BCE) was shocked at the fact that the “daughters of the Spartans... leave home” and “mingle with men showing her thighs.”

The government

“Now once it had struck me that Sparta, despite having one of the lowest populations, had nonetheless clearly become the most powerful and most famous in Greece, I wondered how this had ever happened. But I stopped wondering once I had pondered the Spartiate institutions, for they have achieved success by obeying the laws laid down for them by Lycurgus.” —Xenophon, *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*

The Spartan power was not a cold bureaucratic machine in the dark about passions and impulses. It was a spiritual being that had taken root in the soul of every Spartan that was alive and had a will. Spartan leaders measured their quality in that they were able to be worthy of being receptacles and transmitters of such will, which was precisely the aim of their training and their discipline: to become the tools by which the Spartan state, intangible but irresistible, materialized on Earth and expressed its will.

The whole organization of Sparta was such a unique and exemplary power that it deserves that we focus now on its various separate political institutions, after having addressed nurture, education, the military and marriage, which were themselves institutions.

A) The dyarchy. The Spartan government was headed by two kings who ruled together. Being heads of the political, military and religious power, they carried out the jobs of chief priests and leaders of the Army. This curious sign of two-headed power came out not only because this way a king controlled the authority of the other, but as a symbolic stroke (remember Romulus and Remus) of the ancient, mythical kings.

In the case of Sparta, both kings were symbolically related in religious worship with the mythical twins Castor and Pollux, supernatural giants endowed with overdeveloped senses; sons of Zeus and members of the *männerbund* of the Argonauts that, mythologically, were the first monarchs of the country.

Each king chose two representatives to the oracle of Delphi. In wartime, only one of the kings was with the army, while the other remained to rule in the city. The belligerent king was obliged to be the first to go to war and the last to return. In combat, he also stood in the place of greatest risk—in the first row on the far right of the phalanx. (In the first row of the phalanx, composed exclusively of officers, the shields formed a wall. As the shields were wielded with the left arm and the weapons with the right, the shield protected the wearer's left side and the right of the adjacent comrade. It was a great symbol of fellowship, for the protection of the right side depended on the adjacent comrade. However, the warrior who was on the extreme right of the shield lacked a partner to protect his right side, so he should be especially bold: it was the royal post.)

It was tradition that the king and the commanders who made war surround themselves with an elite guard of 300 selected men, the *Hippeis*. It is said that a Spartan aspired to this body and, inexplicably, was glad when he was informed that he had not been admitted. A foreigner, unaccustomed to the Spartan ways, asked why he rejoiced and the Spartan answered, with the utmost sincerity, that he was glad that his country was well protected if you had three hundred men better than himself.

In the elite guard there always was at least one Spartan that had been crowned victor in the Olympic games, and certainly there was no lack of champions in Sparta, as in the various Olympic games from 720 BCE to 576 BCE of eighty-one known winners, forty-six—more than half—were Spartans; and of thirty-six winners of foot races, twenty-one were Spartans. And Sparta was the least populous state in Greece and its men were not “professional” athletes specializing in a particular discipline, but full-time soldiers for which overall athleticism was a mere hobby. There was a Spartan wrestler who someone attempted to bribe to lose in a competition during the Olympic games. Having refused the bribe and winning the fight, he was asked: “Spartan, what good has earned your victory?”

He responded with a smile from ear to ear: “I will fight against the enemy next to my king.” The victors in the Olympic games were regarded as touched by the gods.

The first kings of Sparta were the twin sons of King Aristodemus; henceforth, every king came from an ancient and legendary Spartan family, that of Eurysthenes and Procles, both claiming descent from Heracles, although Eurysthenes was more revered by virtue of his greater antiquity.

Strange as it might seem, in all Hellas Spartan monarchy was regarded as the oldest in the world: a very remote descendant of a line going back to the very gods and the ancient, “among the snow” hyperborean homeland of the distant ancestors of the Hellenes.

The princes were not educated in the standard Agoge like the other Spartan children. Their education strongly emphasized military skill and strategy, but added the notions of diplomacy and political thought. In addition, the princes were allowed to double food rations of the rest of the people.

In short, the monarchy of Sparta had a mystical and sacred character that permeated their subjects and inspired self-improvement. The kings were regarded as the embodiment of all that Spartan people had as divine.

B) The Ephorate. Under the kings—although in practice even more powerful—was a five *ephoroi* cabinet (ephors, or “guards”) called Ephorate. Originally they were the high priests of each of the five villages, districts or military garrisons that formed the archaic Sparta, but their power gradually escalated once Lycurgus disappeared; they somehow became to replace him.

The Ephorate was the most powerful institution of Sparta. It ran eugenics, parenting, education, the military and foreign policy, and also had the power to veto any decision from the Senate or the Assembly. They served as supreme judges and presided the diplomatic meetings and assemblies. Two ephors always accompanied the king in season, and had the power to call the kings to their presence in order to seek explanations for their behavior if they acted wrong. They even had the power to arrest or depose them if necessary if an offence was committed, but they needed divine authorization through an oracle. The ephors, who were elderly veterans selected for their prestige and wisdom, did not even stand up in the presence of kings, and it could be said they were their “overseers,” ensuring that no king was asleep in the laurels or fell into tyranny.

C) The senate. Under the ephors was the *Gerousia*, the senate or council of thirty lifetime *gerontes*, including the two kings and twenty-eight other citizens who have passed the age of sixty, selected among the volunteers from prestigious and old Spartan families. The Spartan senate tradition came from the thirty military chiefs who swore allegiance to Lycurgus during his coup.

D) *The assembly.* Called *Apella* or *Ecclesia*, this assembly was a popular body that included all Spartan males over thirty years, who elected the members of the Senate and the Ephorate. Sometimes they could approve or veto the decisions of the Senate, although they had no right to question the decisions of the ephors.

E) *On the elections.* It has been mentioned the existence of elections to choose leaders. These elections had nothing to do with the current elections, where the fashionable whim of a sheepish majority imposes an anonymous, and therefore cowardly vote lacking responsibility and maturity. In Sparta the ratings were made by acclamation: the candidate who received the most overwhelming cheers and the most tumultuous applause triumphed. (Schiller wrote: “the votes should be weighed, not counted.”) Contrary to what it may seem, this method is smarter than the incumbent democratic, insofar as it empowered the candidate who always had the loyalty of the citizens, or at least its most determined mass, which is what matters.

Do not forget that this citizenship had nothing of a mob since it was made up only of the Spartan males of more than thirty years whose loyalty, righteousness and strength were more than proven over twenty-three years of enormous sacrifices and privations. In case of doubt, they resorted to a simple method: supporters stood to one side, and the other to the other side. So the vote was direct and those responsible could be called into account, in case of wrong decision.

F) *Nomocracy:* the kings obeying the law. All these institutions and methods were certainly unique arrangements. Plato, speaking about the Spartan power said:

Megillus: And yet, Stranger, I perceive that I cannot say, without more thought, what I should call the government of Lacedaemon, for it seems to me to be like a tyranny—the power of our Ephors is marvelously tyrannical; and sometimes it appears to me to be of all cities the most democratical; and who can reasonably deny that it is an aristocracy? We have also a monarchy which is held for life, and is said by all mankind, and not by ourselves only, to be the most ancient of all monarchies; and, therefore, when asked on a sudden, I cannot precisely say which form of government the Spartan is [*Lams*, IV, 712].

The Spartans, however, didn't split hairs and called their form of government *Eunomia*, that is, good order. They also called their system *Cosmos* as it was everything they knew: it was the world in which they moved and was unique with respect to all other systems.

King Archidamus II of Sparta, the son of king Zeuxidamus, when asked who was in charge of Sparta, responded: “The laws, and the judges according to the laws.” But these laws were not written down at all, but in the blood and the scars of the children of Sparta. They dwelt within men after a long process of training and internalization that made them

suitable depositories. They were not girded dogmas blinded to the exceptions, but were perfectly flexible and adaptable to various cases. The kings voluntarily submitted to the laws, as they were considered a gift that the gods themselves had done to Sparta through the Lycurgus mediation.

In conclusion, in Sparta Lycurgus' laws governed, a sort of nomocracy (as formerly in Brahmanic India or as Judaism to this day), so they made sure that Lycurgus in Sparta continued to rule even centuries after his death.

The Spartan religious feeling

“And in Lacedaemon and Crete not only men but also women have a pride in their high cultivation. And hereby you may know that I am right in attributing to the Lacedaemonians this excellence in philosophy and speculation: If a man converses with the most ordinary Lacedaemonian, he will find him seldom good for much in general conversation, but at any point in the discourse he will be darting out some notable saying, terse and full of meaning, with unerring aim; and the person with whom he is talking seems to be like a child in his hands.”

—Plato, *Protagoras*

Religion in Sparta played a major role, far above any other Greek state. Spartan supremacy was not only physical, but spiritual. This apparent contradiction is explained by the Hellenic religion, drinking directly from the original Indo-European religion: *a religion of the strong*—not a religion of self-pity and worship of the sick, the weak, the downtrodden and unhappy. In Sparta, also, that religion had been placed at the service of a shield specifically designed to withstand the rigors of the Iron Age.

Hellenic polytheism was something deeply natural and vital, and is inextricably woven to the memory of the blood, as “divinity consists precisely in that there are Gods and not one god.” Our ancestors made of their gods spiritual monuments containing all those qualities peculiar to them that had made them thrive and succeed. They deposited in them higher feelings with which they gave way and perfected together a being who existed before in fuzzy and dormant state. The creation of gods is something capital when valuing a people, for the gods are the personification of the highest ideals and values of that people. One can say that the gods created the race, and the race their gods. Through the gods we can know the people who worshiped them, the same way that through the people—ourselves, our ancestors, our history and our brothers—we meet the gods.

The peoples had their gods and the gods had their villages. Sparta worshiped typical Hellenic deities, although two among them acquired singularly relevant and important roles and became the most worshiped deities, even by the time of the Dorian invasion: Apollo and Artemis. They were twin brothers, reconfirming the cult of “sacred twins.”

Their father was Zeus, the heavenly father; and their mother was Leto, daughter of Titans, who to escape the jealousy of Hera (Zeus' heavenly wife) had to become a she-wolf and run away to the country of the hyperboreans. Note here the presence of an important symbolic constant, the heavenly principle (Zeus, eagle, lightning) together with the earthly principle (Leto, wolf, titan).

Apollo was the son of Zeus and brother of Artemis, god of beauty, of poetry (he was called "blond archpoet"), music, bow and arrow, youth, the sun, the day; of manhood, light and pride. He could predict the future and each year returned from Hyperborea in a chariot drawn by swans. (As Lohengrin, the king of the Grail, with his boat, and like other medieval myths about the "Swan Knight" as Helias—obviously a version of the Roman Helios in France.) Apollo presided over the chorus of the nine muses, deities that inspired artists, and lived on Mount Helicon. He was conceived as a young, blond and blue-eyed man, holding a lyre, harp or bow, and possessor of a manly, clean, youthful and pure beauty—"Apollonian" beauty. The mythology explained that in his childhood he killed the serpent Python (in other versions a dragon), setting in its place, with the help of the hyperboreans, the sanctuary of Delphi.

Heracles also killed a snake when he was a newborn. Such legends represent the struggle that initially led the Indo-European invaders against the telluric gods of the pre-Indo-European peoples. Apollo received several titles including Phoebus ("radiant"), Aegletes ("light of the sun") and Lyceus ("born of wolf," as in some way were Romulus and Remus). As equivalents gods of Apollo in other peoples we have Apollo Phoebus (Roman), Abellio or Belenus (Celtic), Baldur (German), Byelobog (Slavs), Lucifer (medieval heretics), Baal (Phoenician), the Beelzebub demonized by the Church and Belial: another demon of Christianity.

Apollo was worshiped in the most important festival of Sparta, the Carnea. There they paid homage to the under-god in the figure of the ram. To carry out the rituals the priests chose five unmarried men who for four years should continue a vow of chastity.

Artemis was the sister of Apollo, daughter of Zeus, goddess of night, moon, bow and arrow; of forests, hunting and virginity, but also of labor and male fertility. Artemis was usually depicted armed with bow and silver arrows, wearing a short and light tunic or skins of wild animals, carrying her hair up and accompanied by a pack of hunting dogs. Her car was pulled by deer, the animal most associated with her, and in fact she is sometimes depicted with horns of deer, reminiscent of the most primitive paganism. She was chaste and virgin in perpetuity, and virgin were her priestesses, Melissa ("bees," another symbol of Artemis). She was harsh, stern, proud, sharp, wild, silent and cold: the result of a patriarchal work, the only model of female divinity able to command respect and devotion to such an ascetic and leathery virility as the Spartan.

The Dorian Artemis equaled the Celtic Artio, the Roman Diana, and the Slavic Dievana; but she had nothing to do with the Artemis worshiped by eunuch priests in the temple of Ephesus (Asia Minor, now modern Turkey): a goddess of “fertility” often depicted with black skin, multiple breasts, whimsical hairstyles, a body adornment and other oriental distortions. (Dievana was conceived by the ancient Slavs as a virgin goddess associated with hunting and the moon. For the Poles, she was a young virgin who hunted in the forests. South Slavs imagined her running through the forests of the Carpathians, and other Slavic peoples imagined her accompanied by bears or a pack of dogs. All these configurations correspond clearly to the Greek Artemis or Roman Diana.) In Greek mythology Artemis was a mentor to the young Atalanta, who became the best runner of Hellas, and no one, not even a god, was closer to conquer her than the mortal hero Orion. Apollo and Artemis were, finally, the sacred twin couple; day and night, sun and moon, gold and silver. They were the juvenile archetypes of Spartan masculinity and femininity, respectively.

Sparta venerated the heroes of the *Iliad*, especially Achilles, but also Menelaus and Helen, kings of Sparta in Homer’s mythology. Heracles was practically a Spartan national hero (remember that, according to tradition, he was the patriarch that founded the royal lineages of Sparta), and his figure was hugely popular among young men.

The city of Sparta had forty-three temples dedicated to various gods and twenty-two temples dedicated to the heroes (including those of the *Iliad*), whose deeds inspired the flourishing generations; more than fifteen statues of gods, four altars and numerous funerary tombs. There was also a temple dedicated to Lycurgus, worshiped as a god. In a city the size of Sparta, the number of religious buildings was very noticeable.

In religious ceremonies, men and women—particularly those in age of dating—attended, entirely naked as they did during the processions, the tournaments, the beauty contests and the dances. This already implies that the Spartans were not ashamed of their bodies, but that proudly displayed them whenever they could because they were robust, well-formed and harmonious. These events were festivals of beauty, Dionysian ceremonies in which the body was worshiped and beautified by effort and sacrifice. According to Plato, a beautiful body promises a beautiful soul and “beauty is the splendor of truth.”

The athletic custom of shaving the body hair and smear oneself with oil before a competition was of Spartan origin, although the Celts were given to body shave before battles. They sought thereby to extol the body; give relief, volume, detail, brightness and “life” to the muscles, therefore proudly displaying the result of years and years of grueling physical training and strenuous efforts, probably with the aim of finding the best partner and/or gaining prestige.

The guilt and sense of sin that Christianity tried to impose in the field of body pride made man feel ashamed of the very things he was proudest. Judeo-Christian morality, by

condemning hygiene, care, training and the preparation of the body as “sinful,” “sensual” and “pagan” gradually achieved that the European population—converted into an amorphous herd whose attitude to any hint of divine perfection was met with resentment and mistrust—forgot that their bodies also were a creation and a gift from God.

For young people of both sexes such festivals served to become familiar with each other, because we think that Sparta was a city with few inhabitants, where thanks to public ceremonies everyone knew everybody by sight and was integrated into the popular. It was at these events where you watched and chose your future spouse. The competition also served to establish hierarchies in beauty, courage, strength, agility, hardness, endurance, courage, skill and speed; and the best men would join the best women, as might be the case for the coronation of a king and a queen in a contest, or a champion and a championess in a competition. In his *Republic* Plato said that it is necessary that the best men join the best women most of the time, and that the worst men join the worst women; and that you have to raise the children of the first, not those of the second. Thanks to this, and to the facilities and even obligations of marriage, the young Spartans married men and women between twenty and twenty-five years.

Let us imagine all those pagan cults of sacrifice, struggle, union and that glorification of the collective existence of a great people. That's pride and socialist joy or nationalism, a cult for effort and struggle through which the Spartans themselves nourished themselves, as the warriors' deeds made that the youngest would want to match them and beat them, they longed for their opportunity to demonstrate their flowering qualities. Moreover, knowledge of the deeds of the society helped Spartans to know themselves; to be proud of their homeland, and to become aware of its grandeur and superiority. Everything was wisely designed for the burning of Spartan pride to last.

What would ritualism in such a “socialist” country be? It was simple and austere, and the Spartans took it with fanatical solemnity, for all rituals were perfect and the result flawless. The rites had to be carried out at whatever cost. It is known that before the battles the Spartans celebrated a sacrifice, usually a male goat: a fertility sign, and under no circumstances they fought before the ritual was consummated. There is the story of how this was practiced to an extreme once the enemy appeared during the ritual. The Spartans did not move from their positions until the ending of the ceremonial, even when the first enemy arrows started the killing and wounding others. When the ritual ended they fought and won the battle. Such kind of feelings, orbiting around rites in which they reproduced symbolic events, kept them in contact with the beyond: where the force of the fallen and the ancient fathers dwelt.

All these elements contributed to form a highly spiritual feeling: the Spartan felt himself as the summit of creation, the favorite of the gods, a privileged, magnificent, splendid, arrogant and godlike creature; a member of a holy seed, a holy race and lucky “link in the eternal racial chain,” a protagonist of an unparalleled feat of an extremely profound

mystical experience that he was convinced would end up leading him directly to the immortality of Olympus, as the semi-divine heroes he worshiped. He was proud of being a Spartiate because precisely the fact that to become one of them it was necessary to overcome the hardest ordeals made him feel a holder of a privilege.

Nietzsche said, "For a tree to reach Heaven with its branches, it must first touch Hell with its roots," and it is said that Odin went down to the huts before ascending to the palaces. This implies that only after passing the most terrible tests the warrior has earned the right to access to higher states, on pain of suffering the degradation to which it leads the drunken arrogance of the one who has not hardened in suffering and is not able to take the pleasure, power and luxury with respect, care, gentleness, veneration, humility and an almost apprehensive appreciation. The Spartans had reached the bottom, sinking into the whole tragedy of their atrocious instruction, and also had passed through all the manly sensations of fullness, health, vigor, strength, power, force, dominion, glory, victory, joy, camaraderie, reward and triumph. Having covered the whole emotional range that goes from pain to pleasure made them possessors of a wisdom exclusive for the heroes and the fallen, and surely no one could appreciate more the significance and importance of pleasures than the Spartans.

It existed in Sparta, as in other places, an initiating circle of priests and priestesses. Little is known about them except that they were selected men and women, initiated at specific sites in secret ceremonies called "mysteries," which made them the repositories of ancient wisdom and esoteric mystical orientation. In Greece, the mysteries represented what could not be explained rationally with words, but that was necessary to see and live it. The mysteries (of Delphi, Eleusis, Delos, Samothrace, Orpheus, etc.) became prestigious initiation schools, with important people attending from all Hellas with intent of awakening the spirit. Much of what we know of them is related to a decadent age which had betrayed the secret, so the ritual was monstrously disfigured and the true mysteries gone.

Mount Taygetos, symbol of pride and elitism of Sparta, was also called Mount Dionysius because it was there where the Spartans worshiped this god in a mystery of elaborate ritual ceremonies, the mysteries of Dionysus. Dionysus is a kind of Hellenic Shiva (in Hinduism, Shiva is said to meditate on the top of Mount Meru): a divine, destructive and dancing archetype. Much confusion has arisen around Dionysus, so we will try to clean up the image of this god.

The mythology explained that Dionysus was the son of Zeus (a masculine and heavenly principle) and of some earthly goddess (an earthly, feminine principle) that, according to some versions, is Demeter, Persephone and Semele. Dionysius had been torn (like the Egyptian Osiris and the Vedic Purusha) and eaten by the Titans (chthonic entities) but, as the Titans ended up breeding men, all men have within them a spark of Dionysus. Zeus

could save the heart of Dionysus and, planting it in the womb of his mother (in other versions, in Zeus' thigh), Dionysus was reborn and rose to the rank of "twice born."

Dionysus was the god of the strong instincts, of the fullness of life, spiritual abundance, the joy of life, transparent pleasure, gratitude; the joyful and furious frenzy of happiness that, wanting earthly eternity, needs the children. It was par excellence the god of the healthy and strong: of that popular pagan joy that overflows and creates in its abundant happiness—or destroys in its unbridled rage—; the god of the instincts that make one feel alive and rise the race above its material limitations or from everyday pettiness.

Over time, however, as Hellas was losing its purity, the cult of Dionysus was easily perverted (being a god of bodily, material and "dark" impulses) and became a fat god of orgies: a noisy god of amusements, alcohol, promiscuity and insane hysteria. The Romans adopted this deformed god as Bacchus, and his followers (mostly cowardly, decadent, perverted, morbid and boring women of good families) made the cult degenerate into orgies including blood sacrifices, promiscuous sex and alcohol poisoning. It was such a scandal formed around the Bacchanalia that the senate of Rome in 186 BCE forbade it and exterminated its followers in a great slaughter.

The supremacy over Athens


At this point, we must address the issue that will certainly be around the heads of many readers: the comparison Sparta-Athens. What city was "better"?

Often we are told that Athens represented the artistic and spiritual summit of Greece and Sparta the physical and warrior evolution. It's not as easy as that. We must start from the basis that it is a great mistake to judge the development of a society for its commercial or material advancement. This would lead us to conclude that the illiterate Charlemagne was lower than anybody else present, or Dubai the home of the world's most exalted civilization.

It is necessary to better assess the spirituality, health, individual quality and the genetic background of which a society is depository. This could ground us in unusual lands, for instance, that the Cro-Magnon culture was highest that has stepped on the planet. As already mentioned, not without reason it has been said that the whole Spartan state was an order, a union of warrior-monks, as the Spartans zealously cultivated a discipline and ancient wisdom that most Greek states had lost. Many have noticed that the harsh Spartan discipline practices have a distinctively touch of a warrior yoga, meaning that any ascetic yoga practice would help the physical, mental and spiritual improvement. In Sparta everything worked within the mystique and the uttermost devotion of the people of Greece, and it is a huge mistake to believe that the only polished Spartan instruction was the body.

Thus we come to the important subject of art. It usually happens that it is a common argument to vilify Sparta. The Spartans used to say that they carved monuments in the flesh, which implied that their art was a living one: literally them, and the individuals that composed their homeland.

But Sparta also had conventional art as understood in the present. It was famous throughout Greece for its music and dance (of which nothing has survived), as well as its highly-prized poetry that has come to us fragmented. Its architects and sculptors were employed in such prestigious places as Delphi and Olympia, and imposed a stamp of straight simplicity and crystal clarity in their works. The best example of this is the sober Doric style, direct heritage of Sparta that became a model not only for countless temples throughout Greece, as the Parthenon in Athens itself, but also for the classic taste of later Europe that has endeavored to continue the legacy of Greece and Rome.



The Doric Order in the Parthenon at Athens.

The Greeks, and particularly the Spartans, studied “physiognomy” to interpret the character, personality, and ultimately the soul of an individual based on physical features, especially of the face to the point that ugliness in certain Greek states was practically a curse. It was also believed that beauty and a willingness of the features should be an expression of noble qualities necessary for a beautiful body bearer, if only dormant. The creators of the Greek statues made them with that knowledge of the human face and of

the perfect proportions in mind, and therefore represented not only a beautiful body but also a beautiful body carrying a beautiful soul. The blind rage with which the Christians destroyed most Greek statues indicates that they greatly feared what they represented, because in them the Hellenes fixed and settled, once and for all, as a goal and template and ideal: the human type that Christianity would never be able to produce.

Many other states, on the other hand, suffered from a taste for the exotic and the cosmopolitan in which all empires fall when they neglect their attention, authenticity and identity. Gobineau called Athens the most Phoenician of the Greek cities (*Essay on the Inequality of Human Races*, Book IV, Chapter IV). Athens, with the plutocracy of Piraeus; with its mob of merchants, charlatans, noisy slaves, acrobats, pseudo-intellectuals, pundits, soothsayers and false Egyptian magicians; sumptuous clothes, rich food, spices, incense, colors, flavors, perfumes, obscene riches, deformed mystery cults, orgiastic ceremonies, prostitution, alcoholism, dirt, disease, and finally rampant decay in demagoguery including cosmopolitanism, hedonism, homosexuality, multiculturalism and miscegenation, was farther from the European ideal than Sparta, which did not embrace this filth (only when it was not Sparta anymore). Spartiates remained essentially rustic, rough and authentic.

In Athens there emerged countless philosophical schools (some of them, as the sophists and cynics, reflecting a clearly decadent spirit) which attests the chaos and contradictions within the Athenian citizens and the Athenian national body itself. Demagoguery and the sagacity of the slave, the shopkeeper, the merchant, the Phoenician dealer, and the nomad of the desert began to leave a mark. And this is acclaimed by historians of philosophy that teach today (Julius Evola pointed out the pleasure with which modern civilization sees in Athens the origin of democracy). In Sparta people did not ramble or speculated because its inhabitants knew the laws of the land, the sky and the species; and lived in agreement with them with no hustle, speculation, or absurd discussions.

The Athenians despised them because they considered the Spartans brutal and simple. The Spartans despised Athenians because they considered them soft and effeminate even though the Athenians, as Greeks, were also great athletes—though never to the level of the Spartans. It is said that a Spartan who contemplated a painting depicting victorious Athenians was asked “Are those Athenians brave?” He replied “Yes, in painting.”

There was a latent rivalry between the Ionian people of an Athens influenced by Asia Minor, and the Dorian people of Sparta directly influenced by their own Nordic heritage, who never stopped being governed by anything but their ancestral tradition and their own popular consciousness. With the exception of Athens, which saw herself as the best, all other Hellenic states reserved their admiration for Sparta, seeing it as a shrine of wisdom and justice: the true repository of primitive Hellenic tradition. Sparta was always the most famous and respected city among the Greeks. They always resorted to it to arbitrate interstate disputes, and most of the times they not even had to resort to force: Sparta sent an ambassador to which everyone would voluntarily submit, like a divine envoy.

The Spartan politics for their inferiors: the crypteia

“Self-sacrifice enables us to sacrifice other people without blushing.”

—George Bernard Shaw,
Man and Superman

The Spartans kept themselves segregated from non-Spartans to keep their valuable essence undisturbed. Not only racism and aloofness, but the lack of mercy towards their slaves were for the Spartiate a vital necessity that soothed his paranoia in the short-term and also renewed it the long-term. Let us turn our attention, then, to the outcome of the acute racism among the Spartans.

The situation of caste stratification in Sparta was unique, because the life of the aristocracy was much tougher than the life of the people. That did not happen in other civilizations, where the common people wanted to take over the way of life of the dominant caste. The Helots did not want—in the least—to submit themselves to the ruthless discipline of the Spartan life compared with which the cultivation of the soil was simple, smooth and painless.

It was the ephors who, each year, with the greatest solemnity declared war on the Helots; that is, they authorized to kill freely without it being considered murder. Once a year, the Helots were beaten in public for no reason; each Helot should be beaten a number of times every year just to remember that he was still a slave. And when the government thought they had bred too much or suspected they planned uprisings, the *crypteia* or *krypteia* took place.

Crypteia is a word that means “hidden,” “occult” or even “secret” and “underground” (words with the particle *crypto* derive from this), taking the name from a test of the deep symbolism that many Spartan boys of instruction age had to submit. Alone, barefoot, without warm clothes and provided only with a knife, the chosen Spartan lad was thrown into inhabited Helot lands. He remained long time hiding in the daylight hours, obtaining his food from nature and living outdoors. During the dark hours, stealthy he stalked Helots and entered into their roads and their properties quietly and silently: killing as many of them that he could, stealing food and probably removing some bloody trophy that demonstrated the success of his hunt. Thousands of Helots fell this way throughout the history of Sparta and probably many young Spartans as well.

This ordeal has been considered as a military exercise or a baptism of blood and a warrior initiation ritual. Some have even elevated the importance of the *crypteia* institution to the level of initiation: a kind of secret service composed of the most fanatical cubs of promising Spartans, designed specifically to contain the growth of the Helots and keep them psychologically subjugated, and revitalize the tension between the two ends of the scale that made the Laconia State.

The young Spartan, after years of living in nature, had become accustomed to it. The long days of loneliness made his senses sharpen; get used to sniff the air, and feel like a real predator. At night he descended down the mountain to fall upon his victims with all the ferocity that his racism endowed; his training, and his natural disposition to sacrifice and death, hiding afterwards. After completing the mission he returned victorious to his home. This was the culmination of the guerrilla training, confirming that the Spartans were not herd animals but also lone wolves: great fighters in droves (not herd because the herd is hierarchical), and able to manage by themselves when needed: excellent collective soldiers in open warfare but also fearsome individual fighters in that elusive, dark, and dirty war so characteristic of the Iron Age.

This guerrilla training could have originated since the first Messenian war, in which the military formations were destroyed and they had to resort to hand strikes; ambushes and assassinations taking advantage of what the field (forest, mountains, towns) could offer, the tactical situation (unprotected, unarmed, distracted or careless enemy) and the environmental conditions (night, darkness, fog). But this mode of combat was also devised as a way of preparing to resist if Sparta fell under his enemies and suffered a military occupation. In the event of such a catastrophe, every Spartan male was ready to flee to the woods or forest with nothing; survive on his own, and run selective attacks and ambushes on the enemy. It was, therefore, a form of leaderless resistance. Another event taken into account was a Messenian rebellion in which the rebels withdrew to the fields; Sparta being embroiled in a nasty guerrilla war to hunt them down and exterminate them slowly. This, as we shall see, duly took place.

Another example that describes the lack of scruples of the Spartans with their inferiors is provided by the following incident, which occurred in 424 BCE.

The Spartan government had reason to believe that the Helots were going to rebel. After a battle in which the Spartans hired recruits, they liberated 2,000 of those Helots who had distinguished themselves for valor in combat. After having organized a banquet to celebrate it and placed laurels on their heads, the ephors ordered to kill them all. Those 2,000 men disappeared in the woods without a trace and no more was heard of them. And as the bravest Helots had been eliminated in this immense *crypteia*, Helot population, bereft of leaders, did not rebel. We can imagine the psychological effect that the massacre had on their compatriots. This story made evident how far the Spartans abandoned all

chivalry, code of honor or moral behavior when they thought they were defending the existence of their people.

Another Spartan law with racist connotations was to prohibit hair dyes. In the rest of Greece dyes were common; as were blonde wigs, the methods of hair bleaching and the elaborate and extravagant hairstyles like those of Babylon or Etruria (and later in decadent Rome). At one stage of the devolution, when the original native breed in Greece was being diluted by miscegenation, the dyes and the concoctions for hair bleaching were highly prized, especially among women. The same would happen in decadent Rome: Roman wigs were made with the golden hair taken from female German prisoners.

In Sparta the influx of foreigners was jealously limited. It was only possible to visit Sparta for pressing reasons. Similarly, the very Spartans were rarely allowed to travel abroad, and even the slave trade was banned. This was motivated by the interest of the elite that its core would not be corrupted by the softness of foreign customs. The Spartans undoubtedly were great xenophobes.

War

War for the Spartans was a real party as, during wars, they relaxed the cruder aspects of the controls and solid discipline. They permitted that the soldiers beautified their weapons, armor, clothes and hair. They softened the harshness of the exercises and allowed a less severe disciplinary regime in general, plus larger and complete meals. Consequently, for them “the war was a break from the preparing for war,” as Plutarch wrote, and this made them subconsciously prefer war to peace.

Each Spartan was a hoplite (a word that comes from *hoplon*, shield), a formidable war machine, a weapon of mass destruction, an elite soldier infantry: well trained, armed and equipped with the best of his time—a weight of approximately seventy pounds. The Spartan soldier wore:

- A two-meter spear (which also had a tip at its lower end in order to finish off the fallen).
- A shield (*hoplon* or *aspis*) of ninety centimeters in diameter, weighing nine kilos and lined with bronze. In the center of the shield a bee of natural size was painted (remember that the bee was an attribute of the goddess Artemis). They were always told that the optimum distance for the attack was that where the bee could be clearly distinguished.
- A dagger.

- An armor made of metal plates that allowed some mobility.
- A helmet designed to cover the entire head and the face with holes for the eyes, nose and mouth. It probably evolved from a more primitive model, as used by the Germans, which usually consisted of a cap that protected the face and skull; a bump down the brow to protect the nose, and two bumps on the sides covering the ears or cheeks, whose purpose was to protect the winged attacks to the head.
- Greaves that protected the shins and knees.
- A sword called *xyphos* which hung on the left thigh, and was particularly short to be controlled from compact rows where the hindrance of a long sword was not welcome. The Athenians made fun of the short length of the Spartan swords and the Spartans answered, “He who is not afraid to approach the enemy does not require long swords.”



(Above, an illustration of a Spartan hoplite. The arms show that the Spartan is terribly muscularly and roasted by the sun and air, since he has been permanently exposed throughout his life. The illustration has some flaws, however. The sword, which should be holstered on the left side of the hip, is absent or not visible. The bronze helmet, shield and greaves on the legs should be shiny as gold, not worn off as the Spartans beautified and polished their weapons and armor, which were clean at the time of combat. There are also extra sandals in the illustration as the Spartans were always barefoot. And the hair color is too dark.)

The Spartan Hoplite also wore a coat. It was red to disguise the color of blood. The visible colors were, then: the red coat, the golden bronze, and the white and black crest, in some places of checkerboard design, like a dualistic sign. (The custom of wearing red textile with the specific goal of disguising the blood also occurred with the Roman legionaries and the imperial British military, the “Redcoats.”)

The Spartan hoplites were barefoot during battle because their feet were so tanned that their skin was tougher than any footwear. With them they could climb rocks and stomp on rough snow or spines without even noticing. Their shield—a most important tool and a symbol of camaraderie whose loss was a disgrace (as for the Germans, according to Tacitus)—showed off the Greek letter lambda (Λ / λ), the equivalent to the Rune Laf, representing the sound “L” as initial of Laconia, Lacedaemonia and Lycurgus; although the rune *Ur* (sometimes represented exactly like the lambda and symbolizing virility) may be a more appropriate “translation.” The phrase associated with this rune was: “Know yourself and know everything.” At the oracle of Delphi it was written, “Know thyself” on a temple, so that the rune *Ur* again fits perfectly in the Spartan context.

Let us now turn our attention to the Spartan warriors. How were the clashes? The captains harangued their men with a traditional formula, “Go ahead, armed sons of Sparta, come into the dance of Ares.” In battle they marched in tightly-closed ranks; with calm, discipline and gravity, relying on the immeasurable strength of all their instruction, to the sound of a flute and singing the solemn song of marches known as the Paean, a hymn to Apollo. It was a type of flute traversière which sound is closely associated with the infantry, especially in the eighteenth century. The sound conveyed trust, safety, lightness and a serene joy.

This close formation was called the phalanx, of which the Spartans were the greatest teachers of leading tactics that other Greek strategists considered extremely complicated. Shields formed an impenetrable wall from which soldiers, in serried ranks, side by side, shoulder to shoulder and shield to shield, stabbed and cut with spears and swords. The Macedonians and the Romans (even, in their way, the Spanish troops and the armies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries) inherited this form of combat that put emphasis on the close order. John Keegan, in his *History of Warfare*, explains it well:

Crossing a no man’s land perhaps 150 yards wide at a clumsy run, under a weight of armor and weapons of seventy pounds, the ranks drove straight into each other. Each individual would have chosen another as his target at the moment of contact, thrusting his spear point at some gap between shield and shield, and seeking to hit a patch of flesh not covered by armor—throat, armpit or groin. The chance was fleeting. As the second and subsequent ranks were brought up short by the stop in front, the phalanx concertinaed, throwing the weight of seven men on to the back of the warriors engaged with the enemy. Under this impact some men inevitably went down at once, dead, wounded, or overborne from the rear.

That might create a breach in the shield wall. Those in the second or third ranks strove to open it wider with their spears, thrusting and jabbing from their relatively protected position at whoever they could reach. If it widened, there followed the *othismos*, 'push with shield', to widen it further and to win room in which swords, the hoplite's secondary weapon, might be drawn and used to slash at an enemy's legs. The *othismos* was the most certain method, however: it could lead to the *pararrexsis* or 'breaking', when the most heavily beset by the enemy's pressure began to feel the impulse to flight, and either broke from the rear ranks or, more shamefully, struggled backward from the point of killing to infect their comrades with panic also.

As we see, it was a kind of war requiring very good preparation; a methodical fighting type that contrasted with the previous "barbarian" combat: more open, freer, individualistic and furious. The evolution of war marked the evolution of the people. They had discovered that they were stronger together and well coordinated, as if they were a single entity, a god.

All the changes of direction or attack were communicated by the music of the fifes. Today, in the military close order, orders can be given with a bugle, each melody is a determined order. The closed order of modern armies is simply a legacy of the spirit of the Spartan phalanx: socialist institutions to the core. In spite of the fact that close order is no longer the key to success in combat, it is undeniable that it reinforces collective coordination, camaraderie, pride, the *esprit de corps* and ceremonial rituals that so matter in our day, and the difference that converting a set of men into a unit can make.

The battles were bloody and cruel. Obviously, the fighting was hand to hand and the attacks made by cutting or piercing through the body with sharp edges or tips of extremely sharp metal blades, which caused terrible injuries and mutilations. As a result, many suffered war wounds or were maimed. What did these crippled do in a state like Sparta? They just turned up in the battle with the greatest fanaticism to accelerate their own destruction and the arrival of glory. It was normal to see mutilated veterans (remember Miguel de Cervantes), blind, lame or maimed in the ranks of Spartan combatants. A stranger asked a blind hoplite why he would fight in such a state. The blind man said that "at least I'll chip the sword of the enemy."

The Spartans marching into battle always received the shield from their mothers, who delivered them with the severe words, "With it or on it": back with the shield or on the shield, victory or death; because if someone fell in battle the comrades carried the body, and then his ashes, on the shield. (The Spartans, like all Indo-Europeans from Scandinavia to India, practiced cremation burial ritual.) The shield was thus a lunar symbol equivalent to the cup, which collects the solar essence of fallen hero and, as a cup, related to the archetype of the woman. In fact, a woman delivering the shield is a fairly common archetypal motif in European art of all eras. The shield had, as a talisman, the power to

protect not only ourselves but the comrades in arms, so it should be considered almost magical.

The doctrine of loyalty, war, and resurrection of the hero allowed the Spartans to march to the fiercest fighting with a calm serenity and joy that nowadays few would understand and many repudiate. Knowing that they would be unable to do such a thing what is left is vilifying the one who, for self-worth and inner will, was capable of doing it. Before the fighting, tranquility was obvious among them: some combed, cleaned or carefully tended their hair. Others brightened their breastplates and helmets; cleaned and sharpened their weapons, made athletic exercises or measured each other in boxing or wrestling. Even before the legendary battle of Thermopylae, the Persians observers reported an astonished Xerxes that the Spartans were fighting among themselves and combing the hair.

Camaraderie, forged in difficult situations, even in the face of death, was an important part of Spartan society, as it reinforced the union and mutual confidence. The cult of strength, competition and manhood made the comrades in arms to exceed and protect each other. Often an adult men took under his wing a young person or child, although in this case the relationship was like that of the master and pupil, as was the relationship between Achilles (the young, temerarious and vigorous hero) and Patroclus (his prudent and wise mentor, older than him): a relationship that without any justification has been classified simply as homosexual by certain media groups. Something similar to the defaming process of the Achilles-Patroclus relationship has occurred regarding lesbianism. The way that our current society averts healthy people from the Greek ideal, the Indo-European ideal, is to ridicule it and claim that homosexuality was absolutely normal in Greece by means of pulling out from the sleeve sodomite and lesbian relationships from any reference of fellowship, mastership, devotion and friendship. And this is where modern historiography, clearly serving the interests of social engineering, has gotten his big nose.

The pace of life that the Spartan male bore was of an intensity to kill a herd of rhinos, and not even the women of Sparta would have been able to stand it. Thus the world of the Spartan military was a universe in itself—a universe of men. On the other hand, the intense emotional relationship, the cult of virility and the camaraderie that existed between teacher and student, in phalanx combat and throughout society, has served to fuel these days the myth of homosexuality. On this, Xenophon wrote:

The customs instituted by Lycurgus were opposed to all of these [what other Greek states did, nominally Athens and Corinth]. If someone, being himself an honest man, admired a boy's soul and tried to make of him an ideal friend without reproach and to associate with him, he approved, and believed in the excellence of this kind of training. But if it was clear that the attraction lay in the boy's outward beauty, he banned the connexion as an abomination; and thus he caused lovers to abstain from boys no less than parents abstain from sexual intercourse with their children and brothers and sisters with each other. [*Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, 2].

The relationship between man and teenager in Sparta was that of teacher-student, based on respect and admiration: a workout, a way of learning, instruction in their own way. The sacredness of the teacher-student or instructor-aspirant institution has been challenged by our society for a while, just as the *männerbund*. Yet, both types of relationships are the foundation of the unity of the armies. Today, children grow up in the shadow of the feminine influence of the female teachers, even through adolescence. It is difficult to know to what extent the lack of male influence limits their wills and ambitions, making them gentle beings, malleable and controllable: what is good for the globalist system.

Others spoke about the Spartan institution of love between master and disciple, but always made it clear that this love was “chaste.” The Roman Aelian said that if two Spartan men “succumbed to temptation and indulged in carnal relations, they would have to redeem the affront to the honor of Sparta by either going into exile or taking their own lives” (at the time exile was considered worse than death).

It is noteworthy that if homosexuality was indeed so natural to the original Hellenes as it was for the Greeks of decadent states, Hellenic mythology would be infested with explicit references to such relationships, which is not, as homosexuality was a plague outside the Hellenic spirit that appeared when Greece was already declining. By the time of Plato, for example, homosexuality was beginning to be tolerated in Athens itself. However, ancient and even some modern authors make it clear that Sparta did not fall in this filth. The fallacy that homosexuality was “traditional” and well regarded in Greece is refuted in detail in the article “El mito derrumbado.”³²

The Battle of Thermopylae as an example of heroism

“A desperate fight remains for all time a shining example. Let us remember Leonidas and his three hundred Spartans!” —The Testament of Adolf Hitler (1945)

This is one of the most famous battles in history. It decided the future of Europe and in it the Spartans showed the world their immense quality. The Battle of Thermopylae came framed within the context of the Greco-Persian Wars, which catalyst was the expansion of the Greek presence in Asia Minor with the extension of the Greek colonies to the east. During the Greco-Persian Wars emperor Darius of Persia had been defeated in the famous battle of Marathon (490 BCE), after which Sparta and Athens signed a military pact aimed at the defense of Greece against the Persians in the near future. Darius was

³² The author seems to be saying that the *erastes-eromenos* relationship always was purely Platonic outside Sparta. The historical record may or may not corroborate this claim. Yet the *erastes-eromenos* (“lover-beloved”) pederasty had nothing to do with homosexuality among coeval adults as understood in today’s degenerate West. (Note of the Ed.)

succeeded on his death in 485 BCE by the very ambitious Xerxes, who craved to take over large parts of Europe.

Persia was a vast reign ruled by an Iranian aristocracy, the descendants of the Medes, who along with the Persians before them and after the Parthians monopolized, during their existence, the domain of the empire—the largest in the world—, stretching from Turkey to Afghanistan.

Persia was a united and centralized state with vast crowds, massive and specialized armies and endless tracts of land. Its existence was already a feat worthy of those who made it possible. Although the background of this empire was clearly Indo-European it had become an abyss of miscegenation, as it held sway over a wide variety of non-Indo-European peoples, including Jews and the descendants of the ancient Mesopotamian civilizations. The Punics of Carthage (in what today is Tunisia) in alliance with Persia were ready to strike the Greek dominions in Italy and Sicily. Europe faced foreign hordes, a geopolitical meddling and a flood of eastern blood of magnitude not seen since the Neolithic.

Greece, on the other hand, besides being infinitely smaller, was not even a state but covered a balkanized collection of city-states or *poleis* that often warred with each other. There was no empire—that would come with the Macedonians. The ethnic heritage was, on the whole, more Indo-European in Greece than in Persia, and the strong political personality of the Hellenic polis made of Greece the only major obstacle of the Persian conquest of the Balkans and the Danube.

In the year 481 BCE, before invading Greece, Persia sent two ambassadors to Sparta offering the possibility of surrender. King Leonidas made them to be directly thrown into a well. This impulsive act, little “diplomatic” and highly condemnable, has an explanation. Leonidas had not been raised exactly as a Spartan prince because in first place the throne did not correspond to him. There was a king, but had poor health and did not survive. His succession fell on the following fellow in line, which had been brought up as a prince in anticipation to the health problems of the previous king. This one, however, fell in battle and suddenly Leonidas found himself in the throne of Sparta, having been raised as a common Spartan boy without the diplomatic finesse imparted in princely education. Leonidas was a soldier: blunt, simple and to the point.

It is clear, in any case, that the Ephorate did not consider just the murder of the ambassadors, as it sent two Spartan volunteers to go to Persia, submitted to Xerxes and offered as sacrifice to “atone” for the injustice that Leonidas committed against the ambassadors. Xerxes rejected the offer and let them go. He did not make a similar mistake, or get his hands dirty with blood or being found guilty of dishonor. The Athenians were more sensible: when the Persian ambassadors made their bids, they simply declined.

That same year, Xerxes sent emissaries to all the Greek cities except Sparta and Athens, requesting their submission. Many, terrified of his power, submitted while others, prudently, remained neutral although their sympathies lie with Greece. Sparta and Athens, seeing that an anti-Hellenic alliance was emerging, called for the other cities to form an alliance against Persia. Few responded. Persia was the new superpower, the new star. Its sweeping advance was a fact and its ultimate triumph, almost a given.

Persia began shipping its army, the largest in the world, and moved to Europe to conquer Greece. According to Herodotus, the Persian army consisted of 2 million men. Today, some have reduced this figure to 250,000 or even 175,000 men (including 80,000 cavalry), but it is still a massive army: a crushing and brutal numerical entity, especially compared with the tiny Greek force. As the Persian tide moved, all the villages it passed submitted without a fight.

Hellenic allies then met in Corinth. Envoys from Sparta, Athens, Corinth, Thebes, Plataea, Thespieae, Phocis, Thessaly, Aegina and others, parleyed on the strategy. They formed the Peloponnesian League, confirming the Hellenic alliance to boldly resist Persia. All Peloponnesian *poleis* (excluding Argos, a traditional and stubborn enemy of Sparta) joined the alliance. The league was put in command by Sparta; Leonidas was made commander in chief of the troops of the league. The leagues were common occurrences in Greece, and they expressed the more “federalist” trends that somehow sought unification and a proper Pan-Hellenic nation. Some leagues were created only to face a common enemy, dissolving themselves afterwards and other leagues lingered; always pursuing political goals and long-term business. The Peloponnesian League was one of these ephemeral “emergency leagues.”

An army of 10,000 was formed of Peloponnesian Greeks under the command of Sparta. Since they had agreed to defend the passage of Tempe, they were stationed on the slopes of Mount Olympus, in northeastern Greece. However, King Alexander I of Macedon, who had good relations with Persia but felt sympathy for the Greeks and especially for Sparta, warned the Spartan commanders that the position was vulnerable by the presence of several pathways, and they decided to abandon it in favor of another more defensible position. At that time the Thessalians, considering themselves lost, submitted to Persia.

The definitive site for the defense of Greece was established in the pass of Thermopylae, the “Hot Gates.” According to legend, Heracles had rushed into the water to appease the inner fire that tormented him, turning it instead in thermal waters. The area was basically a narrow passage between the steep mountain and the sea. At its narrowest the gorge was 15 meters wide. This meant that although the Greeks were numerically lower, at least the fighters would face a funnel that balanced the scale, as only a certain number of warriors from each side could fight at once. And yet it was a desperate move, as the Greeks would soon tire while the Persians always counted with waves of fresh troops.

According to Herodotus, after coming to the sanctuary of Delphi, the Spartans received from the oracle the following prophecy:

*For you, inhabitants of wide-wayed Sparta,
Either your great and glorious city must be wasted by Persian men,
Or if not that, then the bound of Lacedaemon
must mourn a dead king, from Heracles' line.
The might of bulls or lions will not restrain him with opposing strength;
for he has the might of Zeus.
I declare that he will not be restrained until he utterly tears apart one of these.*

Or a king of Sparta died, or Sparta fell. Consider how this prophecy could have influenced Leonidas. Suddenly, a heavy burden of responsibility on his shoulders had been downloaded. This monstrous doom, that would kill of shock most and make them sweat and shake, was received by the king with dignity and sense of royal duty. The mission of any Spartan was sacrificing his life for his country if needed. It was natural and joyful for them.

In the summer of 480 BCE, the Peloponnesian troops reached Thermopylae and camped up there. There were about eighty men of Mycenae, 200 of Phlius, 400 of Corinth, 400 of Thebes, 500 of Mantinea, 500 of Tegea, 700 of Thespieae, 1,000 of Phocis, 1,120 of Arcadia and all the men of Locris. The Athenians were absent because they had put their hoplites and commitment to the naval fleet, which also was ridiculous compared to the Persian navy. But the gang that should have received cheers and applause, the formation whose mere presence instilled courage and confidence to all military buildup, was the group that showed only 300 Spartans for battle. No more Spartans came because their city was celebrating a religious holiday, which prohibited Army mobilization. And for the Spartans, the first and most important was to make peace with the gods and not violate the ritual order of existence.

So the Greeks were together about 7,000—seven thousand Greeks against 250,000 Persians (175,000 according to other modern historians). Imagine the variety of the colorful congregation: the brightness of the bronze, the solemn atmosphere, the commentaries on the diverse gangs, the emblems on the shields, the typical rivalry gossip in the military, the feeling of togetherness, respect and a common destiny. The entire camp had to be surrounded by an aura of manliness and heroism. These Greeks, mostly hoplites, were well instructed. Since their younger days they were used to handling weapons and exercise the body. However, the only “professional” army was the Spartan, because in other places the hoplites lived with their families, trained on their own and were only called in case of war; while in Sparta they were permanently militarized since childhood under the terrible discipline that characterized them, and never stopped the training.

Among the Persians, however, the situation was very different. Although undoubtedly they had the numerical advantage and equipment, most were young men who had been conscripted and had little military training. However, they had highly specialized units. Unlike the Greeks, who, conditioned by their land, had stubbornly perfected the infantry level, the Persians had a formidable cavalry, chariots and excellent archers. In the vast plains, plateaus and steppes of Asia, to dominate this type of highly mobile forms of warfare was essential. The Persian Empire also had “the immortals,” a famous elite unit composed of ten thousand chosen among the Persian and Median aristocracy that, under General Hydarnes, formed the royal guard of Xerxes. The officers also consisted of Persian members of the aristocracy.

Xerxes camped his troops at the entrance, in Trachis. Leonidas, as soon he reached Thermopylae, rebuilt the ancient wall of two meters in the narrowest part of the pass, quartering the troops behind him. Having been informed that there was a path around the pass that led to the other side, he sent a thousand Phocaeans to defend it.

Xerxes, who could not conceive that the Greeks be obstinate in fighting, sent an emissary to parley with Leonidas, encouraging him to put his arms aside. The soldier’s laconic reply was “Come and catch them.” That night, when a Locris hoplite of defeatist tone commented that the cloud of Persian archers’ arrows would darken the sky and turn the day into night, Leonidas answered: “Then we’ll fight in the shade.”

The next morning, the troops appeared in ranks of formation. The Persians had gathered thousands of Medes and Kysios (Iranian peoples) and stationed at the entrance of the pass. At first, their orders were to capture alive the Greeks, as the Emperor thought he could place chains on them and display them in Persia as trophies, the style of the later Roman triumphs. Leonidas, meanwhile, made the Greeks form in the narrow gorge, and took his royal position at the right end of the phalanx. He decided not to mix the different peoples of his contingent. In his experience the soldiers preferred that well-known comrades died beside them, and it was more difficult that they fled in combat if those who they abandoned were lifetime family and friends. Leonidas put his Spartans to the front of the formation, as a spearhead. They would be the first to engage.

Ominously the Persians advanced and entered the gorge. The Spartans sang the paean with religious solemnity. When the Persians began raiding with terrifying shouting, the relentless meat grinder of the Spartan phalanx began to operate silently. The Persians crashed into the wall of shields with a deafening roar, waving their arms and finally skewering into the Spartan spears. Imagine the sight of that.

The blood that had run, the orders at the top of lungs, the cries of war and of pain, the cuts and stabbings, the reddened spears in and out rhythmically as sinister spikes from the shield of chest-plates splashed with blood, attacking accurately the weaknesses of poorly

protected enemy bodies; the shocks and bumps, the terrible wounds, the bodies of the fallen and the Spartans maintaining calm and silence in the midst of the confusion and the terrible din of battle; the Persians, brave but ineffective, immolating themselves in a glorious feat. The Spartans seemed to be everywhere, and there they were, inspiring the other Greeks to imitate them, pointing out that victory was possible and stirring the moral. By their conduct they were proving that their socialism of union and sacrifice was clearly superior to any other political system, and that they were better prepared to face the Iron Age.

Unlike Leonidas, Xerxes did not fight. Sitting on his throne of gold, located in a suitable place, he watched with horror what was happening: his troops were being slaughtered catastrophically. The Persians had much lighter and ineffective armor than the heavy Greek cuirass, as the type of Persian fight was based on mobility, speed, fluidity and flexibility of large crowds, while the Greek was organized resistance, accuracy, coordination, diamond hardness and willingness to stand together as one compact rock before the onslaught of the ocean waves. Furthermore, the Persian spears were shorter and less stout, and could not reach the Spartans with ease. They fell by the hundreds, while the Spartans were barely injured. The best Persian officers fell when, going by the head of their troops, tried to inspire them and were wounded by Hellenic weapons. When Leonidas ordered to relieve the Spartans, passing other units into combat, the situation continued: the Persians fell massacred. It is said that three times Xerxes jumped from his throne to see what was going on, perhaps as a football coach sees his team thrashed. Leonidas would only say, "the Persians have many men, but no warrior."

General Hidarnes removed the contingent of Kysios and Medes, discovering a floor mangled with corpses. Then he made enter his immortals in combat, convinced that they would change the course of battle. Leonidas ordered his Spartans to be on the forefront again. The immortals advanced impassively on the bodies of their fallen compatriots and furiously rammed the phalanx. The Spartans suffered some casualties, but their formation did not break. For their part, the immortals were pierced by long spears and fell by the dozens, wounded and dead. Many fell into the waters of the Gulf of Malis, where many, for not knowing how to swim, or sunk by the weight of their weapons and armor, were carried by ocean currents and drowned.

The Spartans implemented their more tested and complicated tactics, demonstrating the perfect instruction they alone possessed. They opened gaps where unsuspecting enemies penetrated, only to be shut down and massacred by rapid spears poking from all sites. Other times they simulated panic and retreated in disarray, after which the Persians emboldened, pursued in disarray. But the Spartans, displaying their mastery in close order, turned quickly returning to phalanx form, each taking place at the last moment and terribly reaping the Persian ranks, sowing the ground with corpses and watering it with their blood. So passed a whole day. When evening came, the fighters retreated and had their rest. It was considered bad luck fighting at night (it was more difficult that the dead found

their way to the afterlife). The Greeks were exhausted but in high spirits. The Persians, on the other hand, were fresher but their morale hit rock bottom. They must have wondered if they were as bad or if it was the Greeks who were so good.

The next morning the fight resumed. Xerxes commanded fresh Persians, hoping that maybe they made a dent in the exhausted Greek defenders. Nothing was further from reality: wave after wave, the Greeks massacred the enemy again. The terror began to spread among the Persians. Many times they tried to escape the Spartans, and the officers lashed them with whips to force them to combat.

At that point, Xerxes had to be amazed and desperate at the same time. Its fleet had failed to defeat the Greek fleet at Cape Artemision, and he could not outflank Thermopylae by sea. Then came the betrayal, the heroes' curse. A local shepherd named Ephialtes asked to speak to Xerxes and, in exchange for a hefty sum of money, he revealed the existence of the road that skirted the ravine, in a process archetypally similar to what happened many centuries later in the fortress of Montségur of the Cathars. General Hidarnes, in command of the immortals, crossed the road guided by Ephialtes. When he saw at the distance a few Greeks ready for the fight, he hesitated and asked Ephialtes if they were Spartan. He told him they were Phocis, and Hidarnes continued. Since then, the die was cast: the Greeks were doomed. They were going to lose the battle to death.

Leonidas, meanwhile, received messengers (probably repentant Thessalians fighting under the Persians) who informed him how they would be surrounded by the enemy. The Greeks took counsel immediately. Leonidas knew already that he would lose the battle. He ordered all the Greeks to retire except his Spartans and the Thebans. The Thespians, led by Demophilus, decided to remain on their own will, and so they did, covering their small town with glory. When only Spartans, Thebans and Thespians remained (1,400 men at first, less than the casualties suffered during the fighting), the troops breakfasted. Leonidas told his men: "This is our last meal among the living. Prepare well friends, because tonight we will dine in Hades!"

The Greeks formed, this time together, the phalanx. Before them, the vast army; and the immortals to their rear. Instead of attacking the immortals to perhaps defeat them and fight their way to the withdrawal (which would be useless because it would open the Greek doors to the Persians), Leonidas ordered to attack the bulk of the Persian army, in a magnificent display of heroism and courage, with the goal of maintaining the fight for as long as possible and give time to Greece to prepare. They knew they were going to die in any case, so they chose to die heroically, showing an immense greatness. The Greeks were aware that this was no longer a resistance with hope, but a struggle of sacrifice in which the goal was a passionate and furious rush into the arms of glory; inflicting the enemy the greater damage in the process and delaying the invasion.

In the middle of combat, and having killed countless Persians, Leonidas fell. Around his body, a hellish turmoil was formed while Greeks and Persians fought for its possession. Several times he fell into enemy hands and several times he was recovered by the Greeks. Eventually the body was secured by the Spartans that, constantly fighting, retreated to the Phocaeen wall.

At one point, the Thebans separated from the bulk of the Greek phalanx. For long instants they fought valiantly, but in the end, exhausted, crazed and looking lost, threw their weapons and spread their hands in supplication to surrender to the Persians who, in the adrenaline rush, even killed a few more. The rest of Thebes was captured. After the battle, the Persians would mark them on the forehead with hot irons and sell them as slaves. What helped them to surrender? What did they get? Life? A life of slavery and humiliation? Would it not have been better and more dignified to die in battle, fighting to the end?

The Spartans and Thespians, meanwhile, continued to struggle beside the Phocaeen wall. Under pressure and shock loads the wall collapsed, crushing warriors of the two armies. Fighting continued, deaf and ruthless. Many fell exhausted and could not raise again. Others died pierced by the enemy metal. When finally Hidarnes appeared in front of the immortals, the few Greeks who remained, almost all Spartans, climbed a small hill to defend themselves more easily. They put their backs against a wall to avoid being completely unprotected. There were less than a hundred Greeks against at least 100,000 Persians (some say 150,000 and others speak of figures far higher). There, every Greek was facing more than a thousand Persians.

The time of final resistance witnessed the most flaming heroism of history. The last fight on the hill of Thermopylae has been the inspiration for countless works of art over centuries. Probably only Spartans were left. Almost all of them were wounded and bleeding from several wounds. Their spears were broken and their shields shattered, so they resorted to the sword. Those who were unarmed after breaking or losing the sword used rocks to hit the enemy, or fanatically rushed upon him to kill him with their hands or teeth, fist, choking, breaking, hitting, crunching, tearing and biting with superhuman ferocity, in a vicious and bloody melee. Were not these men possessed by the legendary holy wrath, that of the berserkers and the inspired warriors? They well could have asked: "Why do you fight, if you will lose? You are shattered, on the brink of death and closer to the other world than to Earth. Why do ye keep fighting?" But those were improper thoughts for heroes. Their behavior far exceeded anything in this world. Reason had been trampled under the feet of the Hellenic will, which squeezed at the maximum the forces from those heroes. It was a rage that came from the above. It was blind fanaticism; an invincible, visceral, red and instinctive feeling. It was a fight to the end.

The Persians failed to reduce those brave and, totally demoralized, retreated. Then their archers advanced, and loosed successive rains of arrows that finished off the resistant. A

massive, imperial army of hundreds of thousands fighting dozens (probably around a hundred) of crazed Greeks, and still they had to beat them from afar because in melee they could never win!

When the last Spartan—exhausted, delirious and bleeding, with his mind set on his wife, his children, his country and the sky—fell riddled with arrows shot from a distance, the battle of Thermopylae ended. The Greeks had lost and the Persians won. The fallen had furiously slain themselves to the last man, gentlemanly consummating their oath of honor and eternal fidelity and ascended the steps of immortal glory. In a single battle those fallen men achieved a higher luminance than what a thousand priests and philosophers have achieved in lifetimes of dedication.

To imagine the fear that this slaughter of Persians injected into the heart of Xerxes, suffice it to say that he ordered the corpse of Leonidas to be beheaded and crucified. (Similarly, William the Conqueror viciously ordered to mutilate the body of King Harold after the Battle of Hastings against the Anglo-Saxons, who also defended themselves at a high point). This is much more revealing than it seems, since the Persians had the tradition to honor a brave, dead enemy. But Leonidas had shown him something too far above his respect, something terrifying that turned upside down all he took for granted and knew about the Great West. Other Greek corpses were thrown into a mass grave. Xerxes asked, beside himself in his trauma, if in Greece there were more men like those 300 Spartans. We can well imagine what he felt when he was informed that there were 8,000 Spartiates in Sparta, brave and trained as the 300 fallen.

Let us now do a little count of the battle of Thermopylae: 7,000 Greeks against (say) 250,000 Persians. The Greek side had 4,000 dead, including Leonidas, his 300 Spartans and 700 Thespians. But the Persian side had no more and no less than 20,000 people dead, including two brothers of Xerxes: Abrocomes and Hyperanthes. That is, an army thirty times smaller than the enemy inflicts losses five times greater than what themselves suffered. Proportionally this means a triumph of 150 to 1. Comment is superfluous, although we know that, after all, the cold numerical figures understand nothing of heroism and will.

What happened after the battle? Was the sacrifice in vain? What did the fallen get? Buying time for the naval fleet and the Greek counter-offensive. The Persians continued their march to Athens, finding it empty because its inhabitants had been evacuated during the fighting at Thermopylae. The Persians sacked and burned what they could. In the battle of Salamis in the same year of 480 BCE, the Greek fleet defeated the Persian in glorious combat. Xerxes had to retire with an important part of his army, for without the fleet, logistics and supply were precarious. He, therefore, left 80,000 Persians (some say 300,000) under the command of his brother, General Mardonius, to continue with the campaign.

A few months later, at the Battle of Plataea in 479 BCE, 5,000 Spartans along with their allies, under the leadership of King Pausanias of Sparta, decisively defeated the Persians and General Mardonius fell in combat. Persia was defeated. Greece won the Second Greco-Persian War. The sacrifice of Thermopylae, therefore, was not in vain.

The poet Simonides wrote a poem in honor of the fallen Spartans at Plataea. Below, an elegiac couplet:

O Stranger, send the news home to the people of Sparta that here we are laid to rest: the commands they gave us have been obeyed.

What was the catastrophic possibility that Leonidas prevented? Had he withdrawn from the fight, the Persian cavalry would have attacked in mass and in the open, closing from behind and from the sides. Persia would have conquered all of Greece and probably a significant portion of Eastern Europe; perhaps even beyond the Balkans and the Danube. (At that time there was no Vienna that would stop it.) This would have been a disaster for all posterity of ethnic Europeans.

Before parting for the fight, Queen Gorgo, wife of Leonidas, asked: “What should I do if you don’t come back?” The short answer was: “Marry one worth of me and have strong sons to serve Sparta.” In the perpetuation of the race there is no acceptable pause. The road is inexorable and the mystery of the blood is transmitted to the new heirs.



The Battle of Thermopylae was archetypal. Leonidas (a Heracleid descendant, ancestor of the Spartan kings) fell on the spot where, according to tradition, Heracles had rushed to the waters to calm his inner fire. There a statue was placed of a lion (an animal whose skin Heracles put on and contained in it the same name of Leonidas). There is a simple inscription on a plate, “Go tell the Spartans, stranger passing by, that here, obedient to their laws, we lie.”

Subsequent history of Sparta

A society in which corruption takes a hold is blamed for effeminacy: for the appreciation of war, and the delight in war, perceptibly diminish in such a society, and the conveniences of life are now just as eagerly sought after as were military and gymnastic honours formerly.

—Nietzsche, *La Gaya Scienza*

All Spartan education was considered admirable by the peoples around Sparta, who greatly respected its courageous neighbor though sometimes as a foe. Plato himself, when he wrote his *Republic* refers to State measures which seem directly taken from the Spartan laws, because those laws inspired him and were also admired by Aristotle—with some reservation as to the supposedly totalitarian and tyrannical Ephorate. (However, at the time of Aristotle Sparta was no longer the same.) In a time when the Greek city-states were already in decline, voices were raised calling for the adoption of the Spartan model. They were the fascist of the age. Anyway, Spartan laws provided a stability that the other Hellene States never knew.

In the sixth century BCE, Sparta launched new conquests over the neighboring villages. About the attack on Tegea, Herodotus said that one of the reasons was that the Spartans sought the mythological bones of Orestes (son of the legendary King Agamemnon, leader of all Greeks in the Trojan War), considered one of the distant ancestors of the Spartan village. The Pythia of Delphi promised victory to the Spartans if they found the bones. And sure enough, they found them and won. They found no normal bones, but a skeleton of immense size, like the giant heroes alluded to by Homer.

In the aforementioned case of Tegea, the Spartans were bold not to annex it but establish a treaty, by which Tegea was to provide soldiers, weapons and other equipment, and teamed with Sparta to follow it in all its foreign policy strategies. In return, Tegea could remain independent. By similar policies, Sparta won the states around the Peloponnese, eventually including Argos, Arcadia and Corinth to the point that, after the invasion of the Persians in 490 BCE, Sparta was the greatest Hellenic power, well above Athens.

According to Herodotus, at the Battle of Plataea in 479 BCE 5,000 Spartans fought with 5,000 perioeci and 35,000 helots. Only the Spartans were consummate warriors, while others were forced to take up arms, and the huge number of helots (completely lacking in military training) were reduced to cannon fodder. In the period of greatest population, Sparta had 200,000 helots and 9,000 Spartan families. In 480 BCE there were a total of just fewer than 8,000 mobilized Spartan hoplites.

The Greek poet Aeschylus (525-456 BCE) put into the mouth of the mother of Xerxes: "I seem to see two virgins superbly dressed. One richly dressed in the fashion of the Persians; the other, after the manner of the Dorians. The majesty of both surpass the other women. Both a flawless beauty and of the same race" (*The Persians*). With this we see that even at that time there were individuals who were aware of the absurdity of these enmities in people of the same origin.

In 464 BCE a major earthquake hit Sparta that destroyed the gymnasium while the ephebes, the cream of the Spartan youth, were exercising, killing many of them. Diodorus Siculus exaggerated that about 20,000 Spartans died, as Plutarch did when saying that only five houses were left standing. However, the damage had to be large, and this tragedy helped the helots who, taking advantage of the disorder that the void created, initiated another revolt confident in their overwhelming numerical superiority over the Spartans. After the Messenian helots rebelled, the Laconian helots joined and even two perioeci communities: Thouria (in Messenia) and Ethea (in Laconia). Thus began the Third Messenian War, also known as the Mount Ithome rebellion.

The open rebellion was crushed by the Spartans effectively and without the slightest mercy. The spoils of the revolt were removed to Mount Ithome from which, under the Spartan siege, the Messenians were engaged for five years in a guerrilla war against the Spartans: also resorting to guerrilla tactics by using their fanatic "puppies" in selective hunting activities, repression and punishment. The Athenians sent to Sparta a military contingent of four thousand men led by the patriot and pro-Spartan Cimon to help them but the Spartans rejected the help, and the contingent returned aggravated to Athens in what is known as "the Ithome insult."

After these five years, the Spartans, moved by a Delphic oracle, which advised to let go "the supplicants of Zeus Itometa," let them escape the Peloponnese. The Spartan government further strengthened afterwards its severity toward those helots, while Athens endorsed a military pact with the fugitives, recognizing them not as helots but as representatives of a legitimate Messenian State under military occupation.

The Twilight of Sparta

Should anyone ask me whether I think that the laws of Lycurgus still remain unchanged at this day, I certainly could not say that with any confidence whatever.

For I know that formerly the Lacedaemonians preferred to live together at home with moderate fortunes rather than expose themselves to the corrupting influences of flattery as governors of dependent states. And I know too that in former days they were afraid to be found in possession of gold; whereas nowadays there are some who even boast of their possessions. There were expulsions of aliens in the former days, and to live abroad was illegal; and I have no doubt that the purpose of these

regulations was to keep the citizens from being demoralized by contact with foreigners; and now I have no doubt that the fixed ambition of those who are thought to be first among them is to live to their dying day as governors in a foreign land. There was a time when they would fain be worthy of leadership; but now they strive far more earnestly to exercise rule than to be worthy of it.

Therefore in times past the Greeks would come to Lacedaemon and beg her to lead them against reputed wrongdoers; but now many are calling on one another to prevent a revival of Lacedaemonian supremacy. —Xenophon, *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*

The rivalry between Sparta and Athens eventually culminated in the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BCE). This war had a certain spiritual-ideological character: the Athenians saw Sparta as a state of brutality, oppression of the individual and uncompromising stiffness; while, for the Spartans, Athens was a hotbed of decadence and effeminacy that threatened to contaminate all Hellas. In 415 BCE, Spartan emissaries came to the sanctuary of Delphi. The oracle gave them a grim omen: soon the Spartans would see the walls of their worst enemy reduced to rubble, but they themselves would soon succumb to a bitter defeat. This was perhaps the first warning about the coming decline of Sparta.

Lysander, head of the Spartan fleet, effectively defeated the Athenian Alcibiades in 404 BCE, and awarded the victory to his homeland. After long and painful years of siege, hardships, and battles against Athens, when finally Sparta triumphed Lysander simply wrote in his memoirs, in another sign of brevity: “Athens has fallen.” Lysander was a *mothax* (bastard or mestizo), for his father was a Spartan and his mother a helot. However, during his childhood, he was accepted for some reason in the brutal training system of the Agoge. Lysander was, however, a soldier turned politician and conspirator, and stroked ideas about a new revolution in Spartan laws. The mere fact that an individual like Lysander had reached such a high position implied that something was starting to smell rotten in Sparta.

The war resulted in the ruin of Athens, consolidating the Spartan hegemony. That same year 404 BCE the walls of Athens were demolished to the sound of Spartan fifes, as predicted in Delphi, and the government of Athens was taken by “the thirty tyrants.” But Spartan supremacy would be short because it had been achieved at the sacrifice of the best Spartan blood and, as has been said, dark forebodings hovered over the city. Their numbers dwindled. The hardness of the Spartans increasingly produced hatred by the subjected people, which multiplied devilishly. Sparta was aging.

On the other hand, Sparta was usually very jealous about its citizenship laws (to be the son of a Spartan father and mother, and going through eugenics, instruction and admission to the Army Syssitias), so that with the advent of crossbreeding and bloody wars, in which the best Spartans fell, the number of real Spartiates was reduced from 10,000 during its

apogee to just over a thousand, although at least those few Spartans remained just like their ancestors. They'd chosen to be, at all costs, a select few at the top, dominating an inferior majority and remaining loyal to the laws of Lycurgus until the end of their national agony. As a select group, they were obstinate in resisting and refused to make concessions or share privileges, remaining increasingly proud as their numbers were declining more and more. All this demographic policy contrasted, then, with the Athenian: which artificially swelled the numbers of its population (Athens had about five times the population of Sparta) by non-white immigration, uncontrolled reproduction and lack of eugenics.

This resulted in dirty and dingy slums and narrow winding streets, where dark slaves accumulated and infections, rats and pests spread. The defeat of Athens also motivated the circulating of riches as trophies to Sparta. Plutarch wrote, "gold and silver money first flowed into Sparta, and with money, greed and a desire for wealth prevailed through the agency of Lysander, who, though incorruptible himself, filled his country with the love of riches and with luxury, by bringing home gold and silver from the war, and thus subverting the laws of Lycurgus."

In 398 BCE, King Agesilaus ascended to the twin throne of Sparta. A year later, another evil omen happened. While a priest carried out a sacrifice, horrified, he glimpsed a nefarious, archetypal sign during the ritual and announced with great alarm that Sparta was on the lookout for its enemies. At that moment, according to the old man, Sparta was seriously threatened. In view of the prostration of external enemies, the omen was probably not taken with the seriousness it deserved. Few would suspect that the omen was referring to the internal enemies of Sparta.

Agesilaus discovered a year later, in 397 BCE, a conspiracy hatched by Lysander against the laws of Lycurgus. In this conspiracy an individual named Cinadon played an important role. He was part of the *hypomeiones* or "inferior" Spartan citizens degraded for cowardice in battle; for failing to provide the stipulated rations of the Syssitia, or for not having being admitted to any Syssitia due to any dishonorable reasons. The point of this conspiracy is that it seemed to involve all those who were not authentic Spartans, i.e., helots, perioeci, and the degraded Spartans—all of which, according to the same Cinadon, wanted to "eat raw" the elite of the real Spartans. Having made their confessions, Cinadon and his clique of conspirators were driven through the city of Sparta to spearhead and under the harassment of the whips. After being carried to Kaiada they were executed and thrown into the pit.

Agesilaus was accused of breaking an old Lycurgus law prohibiting to make war for a long time to the same enemy so that he could not learn how to defend himself, as Agesilaus' incursions into Boeotia practically taught the Thebans to fight. In 382 BCE Sparta took Thebes, but this victory was cursed as Sparta had decayed and the Thebans were being strengthened. Four years later, the Thebans succeeded in expelling the Spartans in the first

political sign that Sparta was decaying. Years later, 7,000 highly motivated Thebans under the charismatic leader Epaminondas rose against Sparta and defeated them at the Battle of Leuctra in 371 BCE. In that battle only 1,200 Spartans fought: all that remained of them. Four hundred of them died. It was said that when the Theban soldiers entered in Sparta during the street fighting that followed, and they were asking, “Where are the Spartans?” and an old man answered, “There are not anymore, otherwise you wouldn’t be here.”

After the invasion, the intelligent Thebans stroke another huge blow to the power of Sparta: they freed the helots. The city of Messenia, in a record time of only seventy-four days, was surrounded by a wall and the Ithome Fortress rebuilt and converted in an acropolis, symbolizing its emancipation from the Spartan yoke: an emancipation they sought to preserve at all costs.

The Spartans had fallen, but the Thebans had kept their blood and vitality pure. They had an elite unit called the sacred gang. Throughout Greece, Theban women (described by Dicaearchus as blondes) were already considered, above the Spartan, the most beautiful of Hellas. The Thebans descended from Thessalian invaders: magnificent horsemen that arrived to Greece at the time of the great invasions. After being expelled from the Peloponnese by the Dorians, they established their capital, Thebes, in Boeotia. The Battle of Leuctra finally consummated the Thessalians’ revenge against the Dorians.

Since 640 BCE no army had ever managed to subdue Sparta. The Spartan power was over. Its laws of iron and stone—wisely enacted and recorded in blood and fire—could not eternally restrain racial miscegenation while in disastrous wars died the best biological specimens and the spiritual elite. There was betrayal, disloyalty, memory loss, and a fall. From here, the history of Sparta is shameful, desperate, sad and tragic. One almost feels embarrassed before her in contrast to her previous heroism. It could be said it was humiliating for their heirs, but we must add that many of them were no longer heirs of Dorian Sparta since it no longer ran in their bodies the most important heritage: pure Dorian blood.

The racial miscegenation and the fratricidal war with Athens had greatly weakened many Greek city-states, so that they fell prey to the Indo-European new star: the Macedonians of Philip II (382-336 BCE), a Greek village that had remained on the periphery of Greece living in semi-barbarian state, retaining the hardness of its origins and purity of blood. Using the Thessaly League, the Macedonians began to penetrate gradually in Greece. In 367 BCE the Aetolian League was formed. In 339 BCE the Macedonians had already mastered Hellas, including Sparta. The son of Philip II, the famous Alexander the Great, conquered the greatest empire ever known, from Greece to India, and from the Caucasus to Egypt.

In 330 BCE, King Agis III of Sparta attacked Antipater, Alexander’s lieutenant, but was defeated and killed at the battle of Megalopolis. During the Lamian War, after the death of

Alexander the Great in 323 BCE, Sparta was too weak even to participate.

During the fourth century BCE there was a reform by an Epiteadeus, an ambitious ephor that, for disagreements with his own son, drafted a law that all citizens could give their inheritance to whom they pleased. This had huge influence on the distribution of land plots. However, the subsequent ruin of Sparta was not the result of this law; the wording of it was the result of a silent decline of mind and body, materially manifested in blood contamination, the disintegration of the noble families and the evils resulting from this.

During this decadent time of miscegenation and corruption, women's freedom turned against Sparta. Traditionally being owners and managers of the farm and home, they became greedy and selfish. The materialism that invaded Sparta from Athens took root in women with ease. They forgot their athletic naturalness; the physical exertion, and their role as severe mothers; they also forgot the gravity of the sacred wife and to inspire hope and contemplation. Instead they embraced luxury, comfort and embellishments. Foolishly, during the decay Spartan women came to hoard most of the wealth of Sparta.

By the end of the fourth century BCE Sparta was surrounded by defensive walls, breaking her tradition and revealing the world that had lost confidence in herself.

Agis of Sparta (reigned between 244-241 BCE) attempted to reinstate the laws of Lycurgus. He had been educated in patriotism and dreamed in restoring the greatness of his country. By then, lots of land were unevenly distributed and badly exploited, and he wanted to make it more equitable. Agis postponed land redistribution to join the Achaean League Aratus of Sicyon, challenging the growing power of the Macedonians. In 243 BCE, the Achaean League defeated the Macedonian garrison in Corinth, resulting in a brief expansion of the league. But during the king's absence, resistance to his reforms was implemented by his co-ruler, King Leonidas II. This traitor king, unworthy of his name, was the perfect example of Spartan decline: he married a Persian woman and liked to keep in his court an oriental-style luxury which would have caused his death when Sparta was in its prime. As Agis returned he was arrested by the ephors who, now completely corrupted, condemned him to death. Agis was thus the first king of Sparta to be executed by the government.

In 230 BCE only 700 Spartans were left: divided, confused and aimless. The differentiation of castes and racial barriers had collapsed. The plots of land were in the hands of women who managed them greedily, and of helots who owned their own land. Plutarch wrote:

Thus there were left of the old Spartan families not more than seven hundred, and of these there were perhaps a hundred who possessed land and allotment; while the ordinary throng, without resources and without civic rights, lived in enforced idleness,

showing no zeal or energy in warding off foreign wars, but ever watching for some opportunity to subvert and change affairs at home.

Cleomenes III of Sparta (reigned 235-219 BCE) attempted to make another return to the laws of Lycurgus. His goal was to create a group of Spartans that restituted the ancient power of the city. After a series of encouraging alliances with Tegea and the recovery of Manatee from the Arcadians, Sparta seemed to be reborn as opposed to the Achaean League. Spartan austerity was reestablished as well as the team meals, and defeated the Achaean League in 228 BCE, on the banks of the river Lyceum. And in 227 BCE Sparta defeated it again near Leuctra. The victorious Cleomenes returned to Sparta covered with prestige. He executed the corrupt ephors and abolished the institution of the Ephorate. Sparta continued to conquer and triumph: it annexed Manatee and in 226 BCE defeated the Achaean League again in the Battle of Hecatombaeon. This time, supported by Egypt, Sparta was literally re-conquering the Peloponnese.

The leaders of the Achaean League, frightened by the revival of the legendary Spartan power, decided to end its anti-Macedonian policy and cynically requested the Macedonians' help to deter the new Spartans. So Aratus of Sicyon sought help from his supposed enemy, the king Antigonus III of Macedonia, offering control of Corinth. The Aetolian League and the Macedonian League, united, gathered an army of 30,000 men who beat the 10,000 Spartans and their allies in the Battle of Sellasia of 222 BCE. There definitely Spartan power was extinguished; the new Spartans fell, their walls demolished, and Cleomenes exiled to Alexandria. After trying from there a *coup* with the help of Egypt, he died in 220 BCE. With him the royal Heracleid lineage disappeared.

Both Agis IV and Cleomenes III are tragic figures: men of quality who were born too late, representing the dying voice of the Spartiate archetype during the sinister sunset. However, these kings failed to understand the real cause of Sparta's collapse: the luxuries of civilization and dissolution of the originating elements of Dorian blood that built Sparta.

In 208 BCE, Nabis, later known as "Tyrant of Sparta," ascended the throne. Since the double lineage of the Heracleides had disappeared with the king Cleomenes III, he made himself the sole king of Sparta, building again the defensive walls that surrounded Sparta and trying to revitalize the reforms attempted by Agis IV and Cleomenes III. Nabis introduced, with the help of the Aetolian League, a kind of democracy in Sparta. This was his biggest mistake: it gave freedom to many helots, who would soon mix their blood with the Spartans. The *mothakes* (mestizos) began to influence the very Spartan national body, and *neodamodeis* or "new citizens" emerged.

In 205 BCE Sparta allied with Rome in the hope of removing the Macedonians. But in 197 BCE Rome turned against Sparta, establishing an alliance with other Greek states. The Achaean League of 192 BCE forced Sparta to join her to monitor its movements, but

when Nabis felt that the League had overreached its affairs he seceded. Philopoemen led the Achaean army that burst in Sparta and executed the anti-Achaean leaders, including Nabis, knocking again Sparta's walls; freeing the slaves, and abolishing the Agoge. Everything that in this period the Achaeans did against Sparta was an expression of the unconscious terror they felt about the possible resurrection of Sparta's power and it was then, when Sparta was weak, that they wanted to finish it off to prevent any future outbreaks.

In 146 BCE Sparta was conquered by the Roman legions. Under Roman rule, some Spartan customs survived, but stripped from their essence. The festival of Artemis became a grotesque ceremony of simply whipping children in public, sometimes to the death. In the tranquility of the *Pax Romana* Sparta was devoted to these abhorrent practices, which attracted large numbers of morbid tourists around the Mediterranean.

In 267 CE Sparta was sacked by the Heruli Germanic people—the same people who would depose the last Roman emperor of the West two centuries later. The Germans were the new star of Europe, and they would be for many centuries. Their uncontaminated will to power together with their barbaric mentality drove them to conquer and dominate. During this time they were rushing into a Roman Empire already decadent and beyond recognition, in which Christianity was inevitably undermining the sacred pillars of the pagan, militarist and patriarchal society that the Romans once had.

After the Roman disaster against the Goths at the Battle of Hadrianople (378 CE), the Spartan phalanx defeated a band of marauding Germans in a flash of strength. But in 396 CE Sparta was destroyed by the Visigoths of King Alaric I, who ended up being in charge of administering the *coup de grace* to an already unrecognizable Roman Empire.

Near the ruins of Sparta it was built the town of Mistras. The Romans, after conquering Southeast Europe, built on Mistras a new city they called Lacedaemonia, as Sparta was called before. According to Byzantine sources, in the 10th century large areas of the territory of Laconia were still pagan.

Today Sparta is a set of simple, rough and not showy ruins. In the words of Thucydides:

Suppose the city of Sparta to be deserted, and nothing left but the temples and the ground-plan. Distant ages would be very unwilling to believe that the power of the Lacedaemonians was at all equal to their fame... Whereas, if the same fate befell the Athenians, the ruins of Athens would strike the eye, and we should infer their power to have been twice as great as it really is.

“I think that civilization tends more to refine vice than perfecting virtue.”

—Edmond Thiaudière

A nation as exceptional as Sparta, which ravaged its enemies in an era when man was infinitely harder than now; a nation that was feared in “an age that everything grinds and splashes of blood” had an exceptional mission: to point out a path to us, the children of the West and therefore heirs of Sparta. That was the purpose of Lycurgus, and the Delphic Sibyl grasped it as soon as she saw these peoples, sanctifying their mission. But Sparta also signaled to us the only weakness of such a civilization, so that its decline may be a lesson for us, so that the great pain of Spartan discipline and military asceticism had not been in vain.

What happened to Sparta has happened to every civilization: it succumbed to the multiracial curse, the gold of the traders, the corruption of women, the softness of men, the relaxation, the luxuries and the fratricidal wars; although the laws of Lycurgus extended their glory and agony. The best and bravest men in Greece were finished. Then its body was trampled by purer and more vigorous and youthful peoples.

But what is the moral of the story? That the awakening of European humanity, as once the awakening of Sparta, can occur only after the advent of a terrible racial trauma that acts as an initiation of the sort of a “mystical death.” Who will give Europe the dreaded initiation?

Sparta also teaches us something that we can not afford, something we should avoid at all costs, that quality men die without leaving abundant offspring: pure, protected and cultivated; procreated with congeners of identical racial quality. To cultivate the best blood is the solution. Having a garden perfectly ordered and distributed is the solution. And Sparta was successful for a long time, but ended up failing. And it fell gnawed at its roots from the inside.

If today, therefore, we had to ask which country is more like Sparta in terms of its strategic location and methods, only Israel could give an answer. Jewry has realized that losing their head and being seduced by the confidence that overwhelms the victor is the moment of greatest danger, and therefore has established something so outrageous and incomprehensible at first glance as the State of Israel. Despite having conquered the West, thanks to Israel Jewry can even afford to be in an environment of danger and war. There, the enemy lies inside and constantly threatens to attack. There, only the oppression of the Palestinians and keeping themselves in perpetual guard ensures their safety and mentalizing to avoid decay. There they have a fanatical, hysterical, heavily armed and militarized people, surrounded by hostile neighbors that increase even more their

paranoia, their racism, their self-defense mentality and eagerness to compensate, through quality, their numerical inferiority: feeding a feeling to be alone with the danger—an absolutely false feeling as they have on their feet the media of almost all the West.

Compared to the barbarism prevailing in the slums and shanty towns of the Third World; the Asian corporate organizations in the East, the troglodyte immigrants on the streets of the West, and the barbaric state consolidated in the State of Israel, the West appears to be extremely soft, old, head down, sissy, with no instincts or spine, and doomed. Today, the West transits its most vulnerable stage and this condition is increasing at accelerated pace. Our civilization will not be saved if it cannot awaken its primal instincts.

The Spartans were heirs of an archetype: the archetype of the European military state, of the ranks of disciplined troops; of pride, honor, austerity and sacrifice. The archetype, as we have said, would be inherited by others throughout history: such as the Romans, the Templars, the Spanish, the English and the Germans. The Spartans thus formed part of the lineage of giants of the West and of human genius. In their case, they had the privilege of being no more or less than a sole and united people.

Let us compare today's Europeans with the Spartans. We feel panic in finding such physical, mental and spiritual degeneration; such stultification. European man, who used to be the hardest and most courageous of Earth, has become a weakling rag and degenerated biologically as a result of comfort. His mind is weak; his spirit fragile, and on top of that he considers himself the summit of the creation. But that man, just because of the blood he carries, has enormous potential.

The rules on which Sparta was seated were eternal and natural, as valid today as yesterday, but today the dualistic *mens sana in corpore sano* has been forgotten: the physical form has been abandoned producing soft, puny and deformed monsters; and the mental poisoning has produced similar abominations in the realm of the spirit. The modern European knows no pain, no honor, no blood, no war, no sacrifice, no camaraderie, no respect or combat; and thus he does not know the ancient and gentle goddesses known as Illumination, Gloria or Victoria.

All European revivals were inspired by the Greco-Roman or classical European spirit, of which the Spartan archetype was the most accomplished and refined expression. Sparta's immutable laws remain as valid today as yesterday, just waiting for someone to have the wisdom to obey them.

Europa Soberana, May 3, 2013.

Part VII


NS replaces white nationalism

From the editor's desk

As we have seen, what whites need is to introduce another great mythological narrative into the minds of Nordish people. What white nationalists fail to see is that this narrative is none other than National Socialism, which has been so demonized by the Judeo-liberal media that we are moved to reproduce the very ABC of *real* National Socialism, starting with the very first page of a booklet addressed to the German children and adolescents.

For the Hitler Youth

by Helmut Stellrecht



You carry in your blood the holy inheritance of your fathers and forefathers. You do not know those who have vanished in endless ranks into the darkness of the past. But they all live in you and walk in your blood upon the earth that consumed them in battle and toil and in which their bodies have long decayed.

§ Your blood is therefore something holy. In it your parents gave you not only a body, but your nature.

§ To deny your blood is to deny yourself. No one can change it. But each decides to grow the good that one has inherited and suppress the bad. Each is also given will and courage.

§ You do not have only the right, but also the duty to pass your blood on to your children, for you are a member of the chain of generations that reaches from the past into eternity, and this link of the chain that you represent must do its part so that the chain is never broken.

§ But if your blood has traits that will make your children unhappy and burdens to the state, then you have the heroic duty to be the last.

§ The blood is the carrier of life. You carry in it the secret of creation itself. Your blood is holy, for in it God's will lives.

Faith and Action, chapter "Blood" (1938).

Rockwell: A National Socialist Life

by William Pierce



George Lincoln Rockwell was born on March 9, 1918, in Bloomington, a small coal-mining and farming town in central Illinois. Both his parents were theatrical performers. His father, George Lovejoy Rockwell, was a twenty-eight-year-old vaudeville comedian of English and Scotch ancestry. His mother, born Claire Schade, was a young German-French toe-dancer, part of a family dance team. His parents were divorced when he was six years old, and he and a younger brother and sister lived alternately with their mother and their father during the next few years.

The young Rockwell passed the greater part of his boyhood days in Maine, Rhode Island, and New Jersey. His father settled in a small coastal town in Maine, and Rockwell spent his summers there; attending school in Atlantic City and, later, in Providence during the winters. Some of his fondest memories in later years were of summer days spent on the Maine beaches, or hiking in the Maine woods, or exploring the coves and inlets of the

Maine coast in his sailboat, which he built himself, starting from an old skiff. Rockwell acquired what was to be a lifelong love of sailing and the sea during those early years spent with his father in Maine.

Aside from a bit more traveling about than the average child, it is difficult to find anything extraordinary in his childhood environment. He lived in the midst neither great poverty nor great wealth; he had an affectionate relationship with both his parents, despite their divorce; he was a sound and healthy child, and there seems to be no evidence of prolonged unhappiness or turmoil in his childhood. If he later recalled with greater pleasure the times spent with his father than those spent with his mother, this can be attributed either to the greater opportunities to satisfy his youthful longing for adventure that life on the Maine coast offered relative to that in the city, or to the fact that his mother lived with a domineering sister of whom young Rockwell was not fond.

And yet, even as a boy he displayed those qualities of character which were later to set him off from the common run of men. His most remarkable quality was his responsiveness to challenge. To tell the boy Rockwell that a thing was impossible, that it simply could not be done, was to awaken in him the irresistible determination to do it. He has described an experience he had at the age of ten which illustrates this aspect of his character.

A juvenile gang of some of the tougher elements at the grammar school he was attending in an Atlantic City coastal suburb had singled him out for hazing. He was informed that he was to be given a cold dunking in the ocean, and that he should relax and submit gracefully, as resistance would be futile. Instead of submitting, he ferociously fought off the entire gang of his attackers on the beach, wildly striking out with his fists and feet, clawing, biting, and gouging until the other boys finally abandoned their aim of throwing him in the water and retire to nurse their wounds.

Later, as a teenager, he found that the challenge of a stormy sea affected him in much the same way as had the challenge of the juvenile gang. When other boys brought their boats into dock because the water was too rough, young Rockwell found his greatest pleasure in sailing. He loved nothing better than to pit his strength and his skill against the wild elements. As the wind and the waves rose so did his spirits. Wrestling with tiller and rigging in a tossing boat, drenched with spray and blasted by fierce gusts, he would howl back at the wind in sheer animal joy.

This peculiar stubbornness of his nature—call it a combative spirit, if you will—coupled with an absolute physical fearlessness, which led him into many a dangerous and harebrained escapade as a boy, gave him the willpower as a man to undertake without hesitation ventures at which ordinary men quailed; throughout his life it led him to choose the course of action which his reason and his sensibility told him to be the right course regardless of the course those about him were taking; ultimately it provided the driving force which led him to issue a challenge and stand alone against a whole world, when it

became apparent to him that that world was on the wrong course. This trait provides the key to the man.

Two other characteristics he displayed as a boy were an omnivorous curiosity and a stark objectivity. He attributed his curiosity, as well as the artistic talents which he early displayed, to his father, who also exhibited these traits, but the source of his rebellious spirit and his indomitable will is harder to assign. They seem to have been the product of a rare and fortuitous combination of genes, giving rise to a nature markedly different from that of his immediate forebears.

He entered Brown University in the fall of 1938, as a freshman. His major course of study was philosophy, but he was also very interested in the sciences. He used the opportunity of staff work on student periodicals to exercise his talents in drawing and creative writing. In addition to his curricular, journalistic, and artistic activities, he also found time for a substantial amount of skirt chasing and other collegiate sports, including skiing and fencing; he became a member of the Brown University fencing team.

While at Brown he had his first head-on encounter with modern liberalism. He enrolled in a sociology course with the naive expectation that, just as in his geology and psychology courses he would learn the scientific principles underlying those two areas of human knowledge, so in sociology would he learn some of the basic principles underlying human social behavior.

He was disappointed and confused, however, when it gradually became apparent to him that there was a profound difference in the attitudes of sociologists and, say, geologists toward their subjects. Whereas the authors of his geology textbooks were careful to point out there were many things about the history and the structure of the earth which were as yet unknown, or only imperfectly known, it was clear that there were indeed fundamental ideas and well-established facts upon which the science was based and that both his geology professor and the authors of geology textbooks were sincerely interested in presenting these ideas and facts to the student in an orderly manner, with the hope that he would thereby gain a better understanding of the nature of the planet on which he lived.

In sociology, he found the basic principles far more elusive. What was particularly disturbing to him, though, was not so much the complexity of the concepts as the gnawing suspicion the waters had been deliberately muddled. He redoubled his efforts to get to the roots of the subject or, at least, to understand where the hints, innuendoes, and roundabout promptings led: "I buried myself in my sociology books, absolutely determined to find why I was missing the kernel of the thing."

The equalitarian idea that the manifest differences between the capabilities of individuals and between the evolutionary development of various races can be accounted for almost wholly by contemporary environmental effects—that there really are no inborn differences

in quality worth mentioning among human beings—was certainly one of the places his sociology textbooks were leading:

I was bold enough to ask Professor Bucklin if this were the idea, and he turned red in anger. I was told it was impossible to make any generalizations, although all I was asking for was the fundamental idea, if any, of sociology. I began to see that sociology was different from any other course I had ever taken. Certain ideas produced apoplexy in the teacher, particularly the suggestion that perhaps some people were no-good biological slobs from the day they were born. Certain other ideas, although they were never formulated and stated frankly, were fostered and encouraged—and these were always ideas revolving around the total power of environment.

Although he did not clearly recognize it for what it was at that time, young Rockwell had partially uncovered one of the most widely used tactics of the modern liberals. When the clever liberal has as his goal miscegenation, say, he certainly does not just blurt this right out. Instead he will write novels, produce television shows, and film motion pictures which, subtly at first and then more and more boldly, suggest that those who engage in sexual affairs with Negroes are braver, better, more attractive people than those who don't; and that opposition to miscegenation is a vulgar and loutish perversion, certain evidence of being a ridiculous square at best and a drooling, violent redneck at worst. But if one tries to pin him down and asks him why he is in favor of miscegenation, he will reply in a huff that that is not what he is aiming at all, but only "justice, or fairness," or "better understanding between the races."

And so when Rockwell naively went right to the heart of the matter in Professor Bucklin's sociology class, he got an angry reprimand. The racial equalitarians have gotten much bolder in the last thirty years, but at that time Rockwell was merely aware that they wanted him to accept certain ideas without actually those ideas out into the open arena of free discussion where they would be subject to attack:

I still knew little or nothing about communism or its pimping little sister, liberalism, but I could not avoid the steady pressure, everywhere in the University, to accept the ideas of massive human equality and the supremacy of environment.

Typically, this pressure resulted not in acquiescence but in his determination to stand up for what seemed to him to be reasonable and natural. He satirized the equalitarian point of view, not only in his column in the student newspaper, but also in one of his sociology examination papers! The nearly catastrophic consequences of this bit of insolence taught him the prudence of holding his tongue under certain circumstances.

As he began his junior year at Brown, the alien conspiracy to use America as a tool to make the world safe for Jewry was shifting its propaganda machine into high gear. National Socialist Germany was portrayed as a nation of depraved criminals whose goal was the enslavement of the world—including America. Hollywood, the big newspapers,

and his liberal professors—always the most noisily vocal faction at any university—all pushed the same line, unabashedly appealing to the naive idealism of their audience: “Hitler must be stopped!”

And, like millions of other American patriots, Lincoln Rockwell fell for the smooth lies and the clever swindle, backed as they were by the authority of the head of the American government. Neither he nor his millions of compatriots realized that the conspiracy had reached into the White House, and that its occupant had sold his services to the conspirators:

It is typical of my political naivete of that time that when the propaganda about Hitler began to be pushed upon us in large doses, I swallowed it all, unable even to suspect that somebody might have an interest in all this, and that it might not be the interest of the United States or our people... It became obvious that we would have to get into the war to stop this “horrible ogre” who planned to conquer America so we were told, and so I believed.

Thus, in March, 1941, convinced that America was in mortal danger from “the Nazi aggressors,” Rockwell left his comfortable life at the university and offered his services to his country’s armed forces. Shortly after enlisting in the United States Navy, he received an appointment as an Aviation Cadet and began flight training at Squantum, Massachusetts. He received his first naval commission, as an ensign, on December 9, 1941—two days after the Pearl Harbor attack. He served as a naval aviator throughout World War II, advancing from the rank of ensign to lieutenant and winning several decorations. He commanded the naval air support during the American invasion of Guam, in July and August, 1944. He was promoted to lieutenant commander in October, 1945, and shortly thereafter returned to civilian life, where he hoped to make a career for himself as an artist.

While still in the navy, he had married a girl he had known as a student at Brown University. The marriage was not a particularly happy one, although it was destined to last more than ten years.

The first five years after leaving the navy were spent as an art student, a commercial photographer, a painter, an advertising executive, and a publisher, in Maine and in New York. Then in 1950, with the outbreak of war in Korea, Lieutenant Commander Rockwell returned to active duty with the United States Navy and was assigned to train fighter pilots in southern California. There almost by chance, the political education of thirty-two-year-old Lincoln Rockwell began.

It was in 1950 that Senator Joseph McCarthy’s investigations into subversive activities and treasonous behavior on the part of a number of United States government employees and officials began to receive wide public notice. Rockwell, like every honest citizen, was

horrified and angered by these disclosures of treachery. But he was puzzled as much as he was shocked by the violent, hysterical, and vicious reaction to these disclosures which came from a certain segment of the population. Why were so many persons—and, especially, so many in the public-opinion-forming media—frantically determined to silence McCarthy and, failing that, to smear and discredit him?

McCarthy was an American with a distinguished record. A war hero, like Rockwell he had entered his country's armed forces as an enlisted man and emerged as a much-decorated officer. He had won the Distinguished Flying Cross for his combat performance in World War II. Now that he was flushing from cover the rats who had sold out the vital interests of the country for which he had fought, Rockwell could not understand why any responsible and loyal citizen should seek to defame the man or block his courageous efforts:

I began to pay attention, in my spare time, to what it was all about. I read McCarthy speeches and pamphlets and found them factual, instead of the wild nonsense which the papers charged was his stock-in-trade. I became aware of a terrific slant in all the papers against Joe McCarthy, although I still couldn't imagine why.

At this time an acquaintance gave Rockwell some anti-Communist tracts to read. One of the things he immediately noticed about them was their strongly anti-Semitic tone. Although manifest public evidence obliged him to agree with some of the charges made by the authors of these tracts—for example, that there were extraordinarily disproportionate numbers of Jews both among McCarthy's attackers and among the subversives his investigations were unearthing—he found many of their claims too far-fetched to be credible. In particular, the charge that communism was a Jewish, not a Russian, movement seemed ridiculous when Rockwell considered the fact that Jews were so firmly entrenched in capitalistic enterprises and always had been; capitalism, supposedly the deadly enemy of communism, was the traditional Jewish sphere of influence.

One anti-Communist tabloid went so far as to cite various items of documentary evidence in support of its seemingly wild claims, and Rockwell decided to call its bluff by looking into this "evidence" for himself. On his next off-duty day he went to the public library in San Diego, and what he found there changed the course of his life—and will yet change the course of world history. In his own words: "Down there in the dark stacks of the San Diego Public Library, I got my awakening from thirty years of stupid political sleep..."

Rockwell was staggered by the evidence he uncovered in the library; it left no doubt, for instance, that what had been described in his school textbooks as the "Russian" Revolution was instead a Jewish orgy of genocide against the Russian people. He even found that in their own books and periodicals the Jews boasted more-or-less openly of the fact! In a Jewish biographical reference work entitled *Who's Who in American Jewry* he found a number of prominent Bolsheviks proudly listed, although by no stretch of the

imagination could they be considered Americans. Among them were Lazar Kaganovitch, the Butcher of the Ukraine, and Leon Trotsky (Lev Bronstein), the bloodthirsty Commissar of the Red Army, who was given credit in the book for liquidating “counter-revolutionary forces” in Russia.

Another book, written by a prominent “English” Jew, boasted that “the Jews to a greater degree than... any other ethnic group... have been the artisans of the Revolution of 1917.” An estimate was given in the book that “80% of the revolutionaries in Russia were Jews.”

Musty back issues of Jewish newspapers told the same story, and they were backed up by official U.S. government records. One volume of such records, which had been published twenty years previously, contained ministerial reports from Russia of brutal frankness. Typical of the material in these records was the following sentence written by the Dutch diplomatic official, Oudendyk, in a 1918 report to his government from Russia:

I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the World, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless as above stated Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe and the whole world as it is organized and worked by Jews who have no nationality; and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things.

Shocking as were these revelations, Rockwell was even more disturbed by the fact that the general public was oblivious to them. Why were these things not in school history text? Why was he told over and over again by the radio and newspapers and magazines of Adolf Hitler’s “awful crime” in killing so many Jews, but never told that the Jews in Russia were responsible for the murder of a vastly larger number of Gentiles?

Other questions presented themselves. He had been told that England’s attack on Germany was justified by Hitler’s attack on Poland. But what of the Soviet Union, which had invaded Poland at the same time? Why no English declaration of war against the Soviet Union? Could it be because the government there was in Jewish hands? Who was responsible for the conspiracy of silence on these and other questions? He grimly resolved to find out. And, later, as the facts gradually fitted into place and the whole, sordid picture began to emerge, he saw before him an inescapable obligation.

An honest man, when he becomes aware that some dirty work is afoot in his community, will speak out against it and attempt to rouse his neighbors into doing the same. What if he finds, though, that most of his neighbors do not want to be bothered; that many of his neighbors are already aware of what is afoot but prefer to ignore it because to oppose it might jeopardize their private affairs; that some of his neighbors—some of his wealthiest and most influential neighbors, the leaders of the community—are themselves engaged in

the dirty work? If he is an ordinary man, he may grumble for a while about such a sorry state of affairs, but he will adapt himself as best he can to it. He will soon see there is nothing to be gained by sticking his neck out, and he will go on about his business.

Human nature being what it is, he will very likely ease his conscience by trying to forget as rapidly as possible what he has learned; perhaps he will even convince himself eventually that there is really nothing wrong after all, that his initial judgment was in error, and that the dirty work was really not dirty work but merely “progress.” If, on the other hand, he is an extraordinary man with a particularly strong sense of duty, he will continue to oppose what he knows to be wrong and bound to work evil for the community in the long run. He may continue to point out to his neighbors, even after they have made it clear that they are not interested, that the dirty work should be stopped; he may write pamphlets and deliver speeches; he may even run for public office on a “reform” ticket.

But even so, being a reasonable man and no “extremist,” he will feel himself obliged to give the malefactors the benefit of the doubt which must surely exist as to their motives. And perhaps their position is, indeed, not wholly wrong? Surely, some sort of reasonable compromise which will be fair to all concerned is the best solution. If the evildoer had been working alone when discovered, hanging would, of course, be the only admissible solution to the problem: a fitting and total repudiation by the community of his evil deeds. But when so many criminals, with so many accomplices, have been engaged for so long in such an extensive undertaking and have already done such profound damage, surely the most reasonable solution must be just to admonish the criminals—if, indeed, it is fair to call them criminals—, try to install a few safeguards against their renewed activity—safeguards which, to be sure, would not be too grossly inconsistent with the “progress” (or was it damage?) already wrought—and then, letting bygones be bygones, try to live with things as they are.

But, it is only one man out of tens of millions—the rare and lonely world-historical figure—who has, first, the objectivity to evaluate such a situation in terms of absolute and timeless standards and, unswayed by popular and contemporary considerations of “reasonableness,” to draw the ultimate conclusions which those standards dictate; and who then has the strength of will and character to insist that there must be no compromise with evil, that it must be rooted out and utterly destroyed, that right and health and sanity must again prevail, regardless of the commotion and temporary unpleasantness involved in restoring them.

Rockwell had seen the facts. To him, it was unthinkable to attempt to wriggle away from the conclusion they implied. And, as he realized the frightening magnitude of the task before him, instead of attempting to excuse himself from the responsibility which his new knowledge carried with it, he felt rising within him his characteristic response to a seemingly impossible challenge.

It was a straightforward sense of commitment which had led him to volunteer for military service in March, 1941, as soon as he had been tricked into believing that Adolf Hitler was a threat to his country, instead of waiting for Pearl Harbor. And in early 1951, when he began to understand that he had been tricked in 1941 and when he began to see who had tricked him and what they were up to and the terrible damage they had done to his people and were yet planning to do, that same sense of commitment left only one course open to him, namely, to fight! He did not stop to ask whether others were also willing to shoulder their responsibility; his own was perfectly clear to him.

But how to fight? Where to begin? What to do? The name of one man who had done something naturally came to his mind: Adolf Hitler. Rockwell has described what happened next:

I hunted around the San Diego bookshops and finally found a copy of *Mein Kampf* hidden away in the rear. I bought it, took it home, and sat down to read. And that was the end of one Lincoln Rockwell... and the beginning of an entirely different person.

He had not, of course, spent nearly thirty-three years completely oblivious to world events. Many things had bothered him deeply, and he had spent years of frustrating effort trying to fathom the apparently meaningless chaos into which the world seemed to be descending. It seemed to him that there must be some logical relationship between the events of the preceding few decades, but he could not find the key to the puzzle:

I simply suffered from the vague, unhappy feeling that things were wrong—I didn't know exactly how—and that there must be a way of diagnosing the disease and its causes and making intelligent, organized efforts to correct that something wrong.

Adolf Hitler's message in *Mein Kampf* gave him the key he had been seeking, and more:

In *Mein Kampf* I found abundant mental sunshine, which bathed all the gray world suddenly in the clear light of reason and understanding. Word after word, sentence after sentence stabbed into the darkness like thunderclaps and lightning bolts of revelation, tearing and ripping away the cobwebs of more than thirty years of darkness, brilliantly illuminating the mysteries of the heretofore impenetrable murk in a world gone mad.

I was transfixed, hypnotized. I could not lay the book down without agonies of impatience to get back to it. I read it walking to the squadron; I took it into the air and read it lying on the chart board while I automatically gave the instructions to the other planes circling over the desert. I read it crossing the Coronado ferry. I read it into the night and the next morning. When I had finished I started again and reread every word, underlining and marking especially magnificent passages. I studied it; I thought about it; I wondered at the utter, indescribable genius of it...

I reread and studied it some more. Slowly, bit by bit, I began to understand. I realized that National Socialism, the iconoclastic world view of Adolf Hitler; was the doctrine of scientific racial idealism—actually a new religion...

And thus Lincoln Rockwell became a National Socialist. But his conversion to the new religion still did not answer his question, “What can be done?” Eight long years of struggle and defeat lay ahead of him before he would gain the knowledge he needed to effectively translate his new faith into action and begin to carry on Adolf Hitler’s great work once again. While he still lacked the wisdom that could only come in the years ahead, he lacked nothing in energy and determination. For a year he continued to explore the ramifications of the new world view he had adopted and also continued his self-education in several other areas, including the Jewish question.

Then, in November, 1952, the Navy assigned him to a year of duty at the American base at Keflavik in Iceland, where he was executive officer and, later, commanding officer of the Fleet Aircraft Service Squadron there, “Fasron” 107. His promotion to commander came in October, 1953, after he had requested an extension of his Icelandic assignment for another year. He also met and fell in love with an Icelandic girl, who became his second wife in the same month he was promoted. This marriage was far happier than his first. The relative isolation and solitude he enjoyed in Iceland gave him a further opportunity to consolidate his thoughts and to plan a campaign of political action based on his National Socialist philosophy. Feeling that his most urgent need was some medium for the dissemination of his political message, he considered various ways in which he might enter the publishing business. He needed to establish a bridgehead in this industry which would provide him with operational funds and living expenses as well as give him a vehicle for political expression.

He finally decided to begin his career with the publication of a monthly magazine for the wives of American servicemen, primarily because the complete absence of any competing publication in the field seemed to offer an excellent business advantage. He felt that he could not only capture this market, thus assuring himself a steady income, but that service families would provide a particularly receptive audience for his political ideas. His idea was to employ the utmost subtlety, disguising his propaganda so carefully that he would not jeopardize any Jewish advertising accounts the magazine might acquire. He naively thought that he would deceive the Jews and move the hearts and minds of his readers in the desired direction simultaneously.

Rough plans had been laid by the time his service in Iceland was over. His return to civilian life came on December 15, 1954. Nine months of more planning, hard work, fund-raising, and promotion led to the realization of his ideas with the publication of his new magazine, for which he chose the name *U.S. Lady*, in Washington, in September, 1955.

At the same time he was getting his magazine underway, he began making personal contacts in right-wing circles in the Washington area. He attended the meetings of various groups and then began to organize meetings of his own. Before he could put his magazine to use as a medium for disguised propaganda, however, he found himself in serious financial difficulties, due to his lack of capital, and he was forced to sell the magazine in order to avoid bankruptcy.

With undiminished enthusiasm, he continued his organizing efforts among the right wing. Making the same mistake that nearly every other beginner makes, he assumed that the proper way to proceed lay in coordinating the numerous right-wing and conservative organizations and individuals—bringing them together into a right-wing superstructure where they could work effectively for their common goals. He felt that such a coordination could make an almost miraculous transformation in the strength of the right-wing position in America.

To this end he bought radio advertisements, spoke at dozens of meetings, wrote numberless letters, and devoted every waking hour to the promotion of his plan for unity. He created a paper organization, the American Federation of Conservative Organizations, and continued his tireless efforts to inspire and mobilize even a few of the hundreds of right-wing groups and individuals with whom he had established contact, but to no avail: “Our meetings were better and better attended, but there was no result at all—nothing accomplished.”

He sadly learned that all the right-wing groups had one weakness in common: their members loved to talk but were incapable of action. A substantial portion of them were hobbyists—escapists obsessed with various pet projects and absolutely invulnerable to reason, or masochists who delighted in moaning endlessly about treason and decay but who were shocked at the suggestion that they should help put an end to it. Many were so neurotic that the idea of engaging them in any prolonged cooperative effort was untenable. Some were simply insane. Virtually all were cowards. Years of inaction or ineffectiveness had drained the ranks of the right-wing of the type of human material essential for any serious undertaking. Very little was left but the sort of dregs with which nothing could be done.

Unfortunately, he had failed to heed the Leader’s warning that eight cripples who join arms do not yield even one gladiator as a result:

And if there were indeed one healthy man among the cripples, he would expend all his strength just keeping the others on their feet and in this way become a cripple himself.

By the formation of a federation, weak organizations are never transformed into strong ones, but a strong organization can and often will be weakened. The opinion that strength must result from the association of weak groups is incorrect...

Great, truly world-shaking revolutions of a spiritual nature are not even conceivable and realizable except as the titanic struggles of individual formations, never as the undertakings of coalitions.

It has been said that experience keeps a dear school, and in Rockwell's case it was dear indeed. He had exhausted all the money left from the sale of *U.S. Lady* by the time the last meeting of his American Federation of Conservative Organizations, on July 4, 1956, failed to produce any concrete results. He had to find a new source of income and considered himself fortunate to obtain a temporary position as a television scriptwriter.

This lasted only a few months, however, and then he took a position on the staff of the New York-based conservative magazine, *American Mercury*, as assistant to the publisher. He had learned the futility of trying to achieve effective cooperation between the various right-wing groups and had resigned himself to forming a new organization.

Rockwell still had two bitter lessons to learn in the school of experience, however—lessons which the Leader had set forth clearly in his immortal book, but which Rockwell, for all his careful study, had failed to take to heart, just as with the admonition against hoping to gain strength by uniting weaknesses. He still believed that the enemies of our people could be fought effectively by the “respectable” means to which conservatives have always restricted themselves. He thought to avoid the “stigma” of anti-Semitism by working silently and indirectly against treason and racial subversion. This method had the great advantage of not provoking the enemy, so that one could proceed peacefully and safely with one's “silent” work.

Thus, while working at *American Mercury* he began to formulate plans for an underground, “hard-core” National Socialist organization, with a right-wing front and financing by wealthy conservatives. Since the organization was to be, in effect, National Socialist, with National Socialists at the helm and carrying out the significant activities, and the conservative front only a disguise, he happily thought he had a plan which would not be subject to all the flaws of those of his conservative efforts of the past.

His new project rapidly foundered on the shoals of reality, however. First he found that wealthy conservatives suffered from most of the character defects that he had already observed in not-so-wealthy conservatives. Money could be gotten from them for “pet” projects—but not for any serious effort which smacked of danger, particularly danger of exposure. A more fundamental weakness of the “secret” approach, however, lay in the fact that it is the surface disguise, the front—not the hidden core—which determines the quality of the personnel attracted to an organization. Thus, when his anticipated source of funds balked and his one National Socialist recruit became discouraged and left, Rockwell was faced with the prospect of scrapping his new idea and starting again from nothing.

Sadly he re-read the words the Leader had written more than thirty years previously: “A man who knows a thing, recognizes a given danger, and sees with his own eyes the possibility of a remedy, damned well has the duty and the obligation not to work ‘silently’, but to stand up openly against the evil and for its cure. If he does not do so then he is a faithless, miserable weakling who fails either from cowardice or from laziness and incompetence... Every last agitator who possesses the courage to defend his opinions with manly forth-rightness, standing on a tavern table among his adversaries, accomplishes more than a thousand of these lying, treacherous sneaks.”

It had taken two years of repeated discouragements and failures to bring this lesson home to him, but now he understood it. He had finally seen the fallacy underlying the conservative premise. In his own words:

Although it is made to appear so, the battle between the conservatives and liberals is not a battle of ideas or even of Political organizations. It is a battle of terror, and power. The Jews and their accomplices and dupes are not running our country and its people because of the excellence of their ideas or the merit of their work or the genuine majority of people behind them. They are in power in spite of the lack of these things, and only because they have driven their way into power by daring minority tactics. They can stay in power only because people are afraid to oppose them—afraid they will be socially ostracized, afraid they will be smeared in the press, afraid they will lose their jobs, afraid they will not be able to run their businesses, afraid they will lose political offices. It is fear and fear alone, which keeps these filthy left-wing sneaks in power—not ignorance on the part of the American people, as the conservatives keep telling each other.

Beyond this however, he was coming to an even more fundamental conclusion: Not only were conservatives wrong in their evaluation of the nature of the conflict between themselves and liberals and wrong in their choice of tactics, but their motives were also wrong; at least, he was beginning to see that their motives differed fundamentally from his own. Basically, the conservatives are aracial. Their primary concerns are economic: taxes, government spending, fiscal responsibility; and social: law and order, honest government, morality. At worst, their sole interest is the protection of their standard of living from the encroachments of the welfare state; at best, they are genuinely concerned about the general decay of standards and the trend toward mobocracy and chaos. But, as a whole, they show very little concern for the biological problem of which all these other problems are only manifestations.

Certainly the right wing was preferable to the left wing in this respect. At least conservatives tended to have a healthy anti-Semitic instinct. But as long as their inner orientation was economic-materialistic rather than racial-idealistic, they would remain primarily interested in the defense of a system rather than a race, they would continue to look for easy and superficial solutions rather than fundamental ones, and they would continue to lack that spirit of selfless idealism essential to ultimate victory. Thus, as the

year 1956 drew to a close, Rockwell was certain of one thing: Conservatives would never, by any stretch of the imagination, be able to offer any effective opposition to the forces of degeneration and death. As he wrote later, anyone, when he first discovers what is going on, might be forgiven a certain period of nourishing the delusion and hope that there is a safe, easy, and “nice” solution to the problem. But to pursue the same fruitless tactics year after year is evidence of something else:

Conservatives are the world’s champion ostriches, muttering to each other down under the sand “in secret,” while their plumed bottoms wave in the breeze for the Jews to kick at their leisure. They are fooling nobody but themselves.

The answer would have to be found elsewhere—but where, how?

The years 1957 and 1958 were difficult ones. As a representative of a New York management-consultant firm, he spent most of 1957 traveling in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, writing and consolidating his thoughts whenever he could find time. The winter of 1957–58 saw a brief interlude in Atlanta, where he sold advertising.

During this period, Rockwell had an experience about which he has never written and which he related to only a few people. Always a skeptic where the supernatural was concerned, he was certainly not a man to be easily influenced by omens. Yet there can be no doubt that he attached special significance to a series of dreams that he had then. The dreams—actually all variations of a single dream—occurred nearly every night for a period of several weeks and were of such intensity that he could recall them vividly upon waking. In each dream he saw himself in some everyday situation: sitting in a crowded theater, eating at a counter in a diner, walking through the busy lobby of an office building, or inspecting the airplanes of his squadron at an airfield hangar.



And in each dream a man would approach him—theater usher, diner cook, office clerk, or mechanic—and say something to the effect, “Mr. Rockwell, there is someone to see you.” And then he would be led off to some back room or side office in the building or hangar,

as the case may have been. He would open the door and find waiting for him inside, always alone—Adolf Hitler. Then the dream would end.

One can most easily interpret these dreams as a case of autosuggestion, but in the light of later developments Rockwell considered them as a symbolic summons, a beckoning onto the path for which he was then still groping, whether that beckoning was the consequence of an internal or an external stimulus.

Early in 1958 he returned to Virginia. His first effort there was in Newport News, where he produced political cartoons in collaboration with the publisher of a small racist magazine which shortly went bankrupt. In Newport News, however, he met a man who was to play a critical role in changing the course of his political career: Harold N. Arrowsmith, Jr.

Arrowsmith was a wealthy conservative with a “pet” project—but he was not like any other wealthy conservative Rockwell had met. Independently wealthy as the result of an inheritance, he had formerly been a physical anthropologist. He had stumbled into politics rather by accident when a friend on the research staff of a Congressional investigating committee had asked him for some help with some library research connected with a case under investigation. In the course of this work he had, to his surprise, come upon some of the documentary material that had so startled Rockwell a few years earlier in San Diego.

Being a trained scholar, a linguist with a dozen languages at his disposal, having access to all the major libraries and archives of the Western world—and with unlimited time and money—he was able to follow up his initial discoveries and soon had unearthed literally thousands of items of evidence. The story they told was a shocking and frightening one: world wars and revolutions, famines and massacres—not the caprices of history, but the results of deliberate and cold-blooded scheming.

Although he had filing cabinets bulging with military intelligence reports, court records, photostats of diplomatic correspondence, and other material, he had not been able to publicize any of his finds. Scholarly journals returned his carefully written and documented papers with rejection slips, and it soon became apparent that no publisher of general periodicals would accept them either. He approached Rockwell with the proposition of printing, publishing, and distributing some of his documentary material, with full financial backing.

They formed the “National Committee to Free America from Jewish Domination,” and Rockwell moved to Arlington, Virginia, where Arrowsmith provided him with a house and printing equipment.

Rockwell had already reached the conclusion that if any progress were to be made, it was necessary to break out of the right-wing milieu into fresh territory. Right-wingers had been

exchanging and reading one another's pamphlets for years, with no noticeable results. They always used the same mailing lists and sent their propaganda to people who, for the most part, had already heard at least a dozen variations on the same theme. What was needed was mass publicity, so that some fresh blood could be attracted into the Movement.

As the normal channels of mass propaganda were closed to most right-wingers—and certainly to anyone whose propaganda might prove distressing to Jews—Rockwell had decided that radical means must be used to force open those channels. He placed this objective before all others. For, he reasoned, if one is to mobilize men into an organization—secret or otherwise—for the purpose of gaining political power, one must first let those men know of one's existence and communicate to them at least a bare outline of one's program. Until a mass of new raw material—potential recruits—could be stirred up by making a really significant impact on the public consciousness, there was simply no sense in proceeding further; he had already spent too much time doing things the old way. He was, in fact, prepared to take the next-to-last step in his progress from just another *goy* to the heir to Adolf Hitler's mighty legacy. He decided on public agitation of the most provocative sort—agitation of such a blatant and revolutionary sort that the mass media could not ignore it.

In May, 1958, Eisenhower had sent U.S. marines to Lebanon to help maintain the government of President Chamoun in power, against the wishes of the Arab citizens of that country. The Lebanese Arabs desired closer cooperation with the other Arab states, but Chamoun, much to the pleasure of the Jews, did not. The threat of the overthrow of Chamoun and of a pro-Arab government coming into power in Lebanon, thus adding another member to the Arab bloc opposing the illegal Jewish occupation of Palestine, led U.S. Jews to press the course of U.S. intervention upon Eisenhower, always their willing tool. The issue was much in the public eye during the summer of 1958, and Rockwell decided to use it as the basis of his first public demonstration—a picket of the White House. Calling on many of the contacts he had made around the country during the past few years, he was able to arrange for a busload of young demonstrators to come to Washington and also to organize protest groups in both Atlanta, Georgia, and Louisville, Kentucky.

Then on Sunday morning, July 29, 1958, Rockwell led his group of pickets to the White House, while the groups in Atlanta and Louisville began their demonstrations simultaneously. Carrying large signs which Rockwell had designed and printed himself, these three groups made the first public protest against Jewish control of the U.S. government since the Jews had silenced their critics in 1941. It was indeed a momentous occasion: not yet an open National Socialist demonstration, but a vigorous slap in the face for the enemy—a slap which could not be ignored, as all the “secret” right-wing activity had been for years.

Ten weeks later, on October 12, a synagogue in Atlanta was mysteriously blown up. Police immediately swooped on Rockwell's men in Atlanta who had demonstrated in July. Newspapers around the world carried front-page stories implicating Rockwell and Arrowsmith in the bombing. Arrowsmith, who felt he was getting more involved in politics than was comfortable, retrieved his printing equipment and withdrew Rockwell's financial support. For the first time, Rockwell began to get a taste of the difficult times which lay ahead. Hoodlums, instigated by the newspaper publicity, attacked his home. Windows were broken, and stones and firecrackers were thrown at his house late at night. Both by day and by night he and his wife received obscene and threatening telephone calls. Finally, for the sake of their safety, he felt obliged to send his family to Iceland.

With its financial backing gone, the "National Committee to Free America from Jewish Control" was no more. The last of Rockwell's conservative friends evaporated in the harsh glare of newspaper hate propaganda which was heaped upon him. As the new year, 1959, came in, he found himself alone in an empty house, without friends or money or prospects for the future. He had dared to seize the dragon by the tail and had survived. Yet, in the bleak, cold days of January and February, 1959, this gave him little comfort as he faced an uncertain and unpromising future.

As I sat alone in that empty house or lay alone in that even emptier bed in the silent, hollow darkness, the full realization of what I was about bore in upon me with fearful urgency. I realized there was no turning back; as long as I lived I was marked with the stigma of anti-Jewishness... I could never again hope to earn a normal living. The Jews could not survive unless they made an example of me the rest of my life, else too many others might be tempted to follow my example. My Rubicon had been crossed, and it was fight and win—or die.

And then something happened which, in its way, was to be as decisive in his life as had been his finding Adolf Hitler's message in *Mein Kampf*, eight years before, in San Diego. Again, it was like a guiding hand reaching to him from the twilight of the past—from a charred, rubble-filled bunker in Berlin—and showing him the way. Waiting for him at the post office one morning at the beginning of March was a large carton. In it, carefully folded, was a huge swastika banner, which had been sent by a young admirer.

Deeply moved, he carried the banner home and hung it across one end of his living room, completely covering the wall. He found a small, bronze plaque with a relief bust of Adolf Hitler, which had been given to him earlier, and mounted it in the center of the swastika. Then he found three candles and candle holders, which he placed on a small book-case he had arranged just below the bronze plaque. He closed the blinds and lit the candles:

I stood there in the flickering candlelight, not a sound in the house, not a soul near me or aware of what I was doing—or caring.

On that cold, March morning, alone before the dimly lit altar, Lincoln Rockwell underwent an experience of a sort shared by few men in the long history of our race—an experience which comes seldom to this world but which may radically alter the course of that world when it does. Nearly fifty-three years before, a similar experience had befallen a man—that time on a cold, November night, on a hilltop overlooking the Austrian town of Linz.

It was a religious experience that was more than religious. As he stood there he felt an indescribable torrent of emotions surging through his being, reaching higher and higher in a crescendo with a peak of unbearable intensity. He felt the awe-inspiring awareness for a few moments, or a few minutes, of being more than himself, of being in communion with that which is beyond description and beyond comprehension. Something with the cool, vast feeling of eternity and of infinity—of long ages spanning the birth and death of suns, and of immense, starry vistas—filled his soul to the bursting point. One may call that Something by different names—the Great Spirit, perhaps, or Destiny, or the Soul of the Universe, or God—but once it has brushed the soul of a man, that man can never again be wholly what he was before. It changes him spiritually in the same way that a mighty earthquake or a cataclysmic eruption, the subsidence of a continent or the bursting forth of a new mountain range, changes forever the face of the earth.

Slowly the storm subsided, and Lincoln Rockwell—a new Lincoln Rockwell—became aware once again of the room about him and of his own thoughts. He has described for us his feeling then:

Where before I had wanted to fight the forces of tyranny and regression, now I HAD to fight them. But even more, I felt within me the power to prevail—strength beyond my own strength—the ability to do the right thing even when I was personally overwhelmed by events. And that strength has not yet failed me. Nor will it fail... I knew with calm certainty exactly what to do, and I knew, in a hard-to-explain sense, what was ahead. It was something like looking at a road from the air after seeing only the curve ahead from the ground... Hitler had shown the way to survival. It would be my task on this earth to carry his ideas... to total, world-wide victory. I knew I would not live to see the victory which I would make possible. But I would not die before I had made that victory certain.

And just as Adolf Hitler had said of his experience on the Freinberg, “In that hour it began,” so in that hour it began for Lincoln Rockwell also. He did not realize it then, of course, but this climactic event had come almost exactly in the middle of his political life; he had run just half the course from that fall day in 1950, in the San Diego Public Library, to a martyr’s death in Arlington in the late summer of 1967.

Before, he had been a right-winger, a conservative, albeit a more and more openly anti-Jewish one; before, he had felt the need to keep his National Socialism concealed; before, while he had admired Adolf Hitler as the greatest thinker in the history of the race and

Mein Kampf as the most important book ever written, they had not been wholly real to him—and this attitude had resulted in his failure so often to apply the Leader's teachings to his own political efforts. Now, however, he was no longer a conservative, but a National Socialist, and he would bear witness for his faith before the whole world; now, at last, he recognized in Adolf Hitler not just an extraordinarily great mind and spirit, but something immortal, transcendental, more than human; now he saw the Leader as an embodiment, in a way, of that Universal Soul with which he had briefly communed; now he was prepared to follow the Leader's teachings without reservation, in all things.

At the same time that these fundamental changes in his outlook took place, he saw the need for a fundamental change in his political tactics. He recalled the Leader's words:

Any man who is not attacked in the Jewish newspapers, not slandered and vilified, is no true National Socialist. The best measure of the value of his will is the hostility he receives from the mortal enemy of our people...

Every Jewish slander and every Jewish lie is a scar of honor on the body of our warriors.

The man they have most reviled stands closest to us, and the man they hate worst is our best friend.

Anyone who picks up a Jewish newspaper in the morning and does not see himself slandered in it has not made profitable use of the previous day; for if he had, he would be persecuted, reviled, slandered, abused, befouled. And only the man who combats this mortal enemy of our nation and of all Aryan humanity and culture most effectively may expect to see the slanders of this race and the efforts of this people directed against him.

And further:

It makes no difference whatever whether they laugh at us or revile us, whether they represent us as clowns or criminals; the main thing is that they mention us, that they concern themselves with us again and again, and that we gradually appear to be the only power that anyone reckons with at the moment. What we really are and what we really want, we will show the Jewish journalistic rabble when the day comes.

Rockwell had already recognized the need for gaining mass publicity by radical means, but he had flinched at the thought of the slander and vilification, the misrepresentation and ridicule which must inevitably accompany any publicity he received through the alien-dominated mass media. He had been living in the conservative dream world and had shared with other right-wingers the comfortable illusion that one can keep the enemy fooled—even make him think one is his friend—and fight him effectively at the same time.

Even as he gradually became more forthright in his statements with respect to the Jewish question, he retained the feeling that to speak out openly for Adolf Hitler's National Socialist world view would be nothing short of suicide.

Thus he had fallen between two stools after his demonstration of July 29, 1958. He had been numbed by the virulence of the hatred unleashed against him, and at the same time found himself crippled by self-imposed limitations in his own campaign.

Now, however, he had decided that not only would he never again flinch under the torrent of abuse and slander which his activities were sure to bring down on him, but he would provoke such attacks by the enemy, looking upon each one as a "scar of honor" and also as another small step toward his eventual general recognition as the opponent of everything the enemy stood for, as "the only power with which [that enemy] reckoned." And he saw that an open avowal of his National Socialism was not only the strongest irritant he could bring to bear against his enemy, but it was the only realistic basis for gathering around himself those elements of the population needed to build a viable and lasting movement with which eventually to destroy that enemy and restore his own race to the position of strength and health and honor from which it had abdicated.

Actually, he carried the Leader's counsel about the use of the enemy's own propaganda to its logical extreme. Looking at the task before him realistically for the first time, he saw that the problems he faced were so severe that, in order to make any progress against them, he would be obliged to concentrate all his energies upon one aspect of those problems at a time.

The first step was general recognition. His earlier conviction that that goal must be attained at the expense of every other consideration was now stronger than ever. Thus, instead of following the natural urge to dissociate National Socialism from the Hollywood image that Jewry had been building for it for more than three decades, he temporarily threw all hopes of "respectability"—even among other National Socialists—aside and set about turning to his own advantage all the Jews' previous efforts.

Toward this end he deliberately pinned on himself the label "Nazi" rather than "National Socialist," using this bit of journalistic jargon which had been coined by the enemy during the early days of struggle in Germany, a term looked upon by National Socialists with about the same feeling that convinced Marxists must look upon the designation "commie" or "pinko." Behind this step—one which was to cause much misunderstanding and suspicion in days to come—was the cold-blooded realization that a strutting, shouting uniform-wearing, Hollywood-style "Nazi" was vastly more newsworthy, had vastly more "shock value," than any mere National Socialist.

As he pondered over his soul-stirring experience and began to lay new plans for the future during the next few days, events began flowing in the new channel marked out for them by the finger of Destiny. Three men, a right-wing acquaintance and two other men who were strangers to Rockwell, dropped in to see him one evening. Initially shocked and repelled by the swastika banner in his living room, they were soon won over by his passionate exposition of the new cause. Two of the three remained to become his first disciples.

Then he opened the blinds on his windows, making his swastika banner visible from the street. He issued swastika armbands to his two recruits, and the three of them swaggered about the house wearing holstered pistols. Later he mounted an illuminated swastika on the roof.

The crowds came to laugh and jeer and throw rocks-but a few remained to listen. His “stormtroopers” grew in number from two, to four, to ten.

These March days in 1959, which witnessed the first genuine rebirth of National Socialist activity after nearly fourteen years of terror and total suppression, marked the beginning of the stormiest and most difficult times Rockwell faced. Harassed by the police with illegal searches and confiscation of his property and materials, assaulted by thugs and vandals whom the police made no efforts to apprehend, he and his small group of followers printed and distributed tens of thousands of leaflets and talked to throngs of curious and hostile visitors who came to see the “American Fuehrer,” as the newspapers laughingly called him. He first chose the name “American Party” for his embryonic organization, but soon changed the name to “American Nazi Party.”

Keeping his initial objective foremost in his mind, he concentrated the activities of his small group primarily on the distribution of inflammatory leaflets, on creating public incidents, on haranguing crowds under circumstances especially chosen to provoke violent opposition—anything and everything, in other words, to gain mass publicity, to become generally recognized as the opponent of the Jews and everything they represented, from Marxism to unprincipled capitalism, from racial degeneration to cultural Bolshevism.

His first soapbox-style public address was delivered on the Mall, in Washington, on Sunday, April 3, 1960, and became a regular occurrence for some time thereafter. A letter he wrote to his mother during this early period of public speaking gives an idea of a few of the difficulties he faced:

7 July, 1960

Dear Mother:

Thank you for the letter and the help. It is much appreciated... Don't pay too much attention to what the papers say, Mother they lie unbelievably. Last week they tried to

murder us again on the Mall here and almost killed Major Morgan, whom you met, when they dragged him out—ten of them—and stomped him and left him for dead. But we prevailed, and even though the police, much against their will, were forced to arrest us for “disorderly conduct” (for being attacked by a murderous mob!), the people are with us. This sort of thing is inevitable, and it will get worse. Now they have tried—yesterday—to have me heaved in an insane asylum to shut me up, but they were surprised, as I was relieved, when people rushed forward to offer the huge cash bond they set for me and I will have a psychiatrist of my own choosing deliver a report, instead of the two Jews they planned for me. Do not worry about all this. It is dangerous, painful, and bitter when our own people do not understand what we are doing and suffering for them, but I am sure that the Lord will not permit liars and villains to win in the end. You will yet be mighty proud...

Love,

Link

In May, 1960, the *National Socialist Bulletin* made its appearance as the first periodical published by the American Nazi Party. It evolved in to the *Stormtrooper* magazine after eight issues. Meanwhile, on February 5, 1960, the United States Navy, under pressure from Jewish groups, forced Rockwell to accept a discharge from the Naval Reserve.

Despite the news quarantine imposed on him, despite beatings and jailings, despite a chronic lack of funds, despite serious personnel problems, and despite a thousand other troubles and difficulties, his campaign to gain public recognition made steady progress. Newspapers found it impossible to completely avoid mentioning his brash and daring exploits; editors and columnists found irresistible the temptation to denounce or “expose” him. Even radio and television emcees, ever on the prowl for sensation, yielded to temptation and defied the ban on publicity for Rockwell.

The image of George Lincoln Rockwell and the America Nazi Party created by the mass media for public consumption was, of course, a grossly distorted one. Rockwell had succeeded in forcing the media, more or less against their will, to give him publicity. Unfortunately, he could not force them to be impartial in their treatment, or even to be truthful. An interview with him published in the popular magazine, *Playboy*, was prefaced with such editorial remarks as: “Unlike controversial past interviewees Rockwell could not be called a spokesman for any socially or politically significant minority. But we felt that the very virulence of Rockwell’s messianic master-racism could transform a really searching conversation with the 48-year-old Fuhrer into a revealing portrait of both rampant racism and the pathology of fascism.”

Another commented: “The question of George Lincoln Rockwell boils down, then, to the question of how far can America let the hate-mongers go. Will an unsound branch on the tree of American democracy fall off or will it poison the organism?”

The really ambitious writers, editors, and reporters did not restrict themselves to such mildly prejudicial remarks but vied with one another in concocting outrageous lies about Rockwell. He was accused of cowardice, sadism, selfish gormandizing, kidnapping: “Like the late Adolf Schickelgruber, on whom he models himself, he believes in leading from behind—as far behind as possible.” In one magazine he was “quoted” as boasting that he had once castrated a heckler with his bare hands,” and another reported: “George Rockwell’s hysterical raving has already whipped up the lunatic fringe to the breaking point. Last summer three of his stormtroopers decided to please the Fuehrer by kidnapping a small Jewish child in Washington, D.C., and holding him at the Party Headquarters for several hours. How many more innocent citizens will be subjected to harassment before Robert F. Kennedy and the Justice Department move in?”

Topping them all was the story that “Like a true Nazi top dog, he avails himself of top-dog privileges and orders private meals served in his room. He partakes of such fancy fare as turtle soup, lobster, and steak while the men eat hash. Between meals he enjoys sucking kumquats.” This last flight of fancy is reminiscent of articles published in the German press (before 1933) which portrayed Adolf Hitler as a drunken profligate (Hitler only drank once in his entire life: the night of his High School Graduation) and lecher who dissipated the contributions of his followers in high living, champagne parties, and whoring.

Rockwell accepted these lies and slanders philosophically, for the alternative to this Jew-designed public image even was no public image at all. As a matter of fact, the Jews—and non-Jewish publicists anxious to demonstrate their affection for the Jews—cannot be given all the blame for this poor image. Rockwell himself lent a conscious hand to its creation, as he admitted when he said, “When I have the rare opportunity to use some mass medium, as was recently the case when I gave an interview to *Playboy*, I am forced to walk a careful line between what I should like to say and what the enemy would like to hear me say. Unless I deliberately sound at least halfway like a raving illiterate with three loose screws, such an interview would never be printed.”

The price he paid for becoming generally recognized as “Mr. Nazi” was a high one indeed. Other men with sound racial instincts but without Rockwell’s understanding of political realities were, naturally enough, appalled by what seemed to be Rockwell’s ridiculous antics. Most people, even relatively sophisticated ones who talk knowingly about “managed news,” simply find incomprehensible the Jewish Big Lie technique.

These sound but simple citizens all too often jumped to the not-implausible conclusion that Rockwell was a kind of *agent provocateur*, a traitor hired by the enemy to discredit honest racists and patriots. His correspondence with some of them displays a mixture of impatience with their inability to perceive the essence of the real problems facing our race, and a sincere desire to evoke understanding. The following extracts from a letter to a

member of a snobbish racist group calling itself the “European Liberation Front” are typical:

Dear Mr ____:

I realize that I am only a stupid, silly American, but I do love this country, in spite of your denunciation of it. What you hate about it is what the Jews have done to it, and you are like a man who permits his wife to be debauched by rapists and then tosses her in the garbage can for it. Shame on you! “American” influence on Europe is not American at all, and you damned sure should know it. The real American influence was Henry Ford, our West, and the like.

Europe is a tired old man—more like a tired old lady—and if Western culture is to be saved, it will be saved by the last Western barbarians, the American barbarians I love. Men like you, suave, polished, educated, supercilious, and “above” nasty physical violence, cannot save themselves, let alone a nation, a culture, or a race. You people with your “European Liberation Front” are going at it backwards. You can’t liberate Europe any more with Europeans. Hitler gave that effort every bit of holy genius within him, and he was mashed by the American barbarians. You and your egghead gang of dandies are in love with what is gone and insist on ignoring what is here. Rome is no more. You keep trying to resurrect it, and you can’t, because there are no more noble Romans over there, at least not enough to make a real fight of it. Europe is like one big France—all empty shell, fine words, pretty songs, and dead men. We helped kill Europe. If you did liberate it, like France was “liberated,” it would sink into degeneracy again in a century...

There are, of course, good, vigorous fighting men in Europe, but they are swamped by the human garbage left in the wreckage of two wars promoted by Jews and fought by Americans. I am building National Socialism here, by such expedients and methods as may be possible, and I am succeeding, in spite of your looking down your nose at me...

Whenever I can get some or the other of you to ditch the “We’re-the-real-National Socialists” game and start being National Socialists, I give strength to the cause to which I have given my life, my family, my comfort, and everything else I have to give, no matter what you may have been told...

Frankness, not diplomacy, was his strong point.

In order to allay hostility and suspicion as much as he could, he was soon obliged to divert some of his energies from agitation and publicity garnering to a more sober exposition of his ideas. His first major effort in that direction was the publication of his political autobiography, *This Time the World*. Written hastily in the fall of 1960 between speaking engagements, court appearances, street brawls, and desperate attempts to raise money to

sustain his small group, he was not able to publish it until a year later. The printing and binding of the book were done entirely by his untrained stormtroopers, and their only machinery was a tiny, office-style duplicator. The absolute sincerity of its tone failed to convince few of its readers, but the difficulties of distribution, due to the Jewish “quarantine,” limited its circulation to a few thousand copies.

In October, 1961, the first of his *Rockwell Reports* appeared. Varying in length from four to thirty-six pages, the *Rockwell Reports* appeared semi-monthly at first, then monthly, occasionally lapsing into bi-monthly publication during particularly difficult periods. The *Rockwell Reports* contained a lively mixture of National Socialist ideology, current political analysis, prognostication, political cartoons and drawings, reproductions of pertinent news clippings, and photographs of Party activities. They all bore his unique stamp and, more than any other one thing, were responsible for drawing to him the idealistic young men who formed the cadre of the growing movement.

From the beginning, Rockwell had understood the necessity for the National Socialist movement eventually to operate from a worldwide basis. For the ultimate political goal of the Movement was the establishment of an Aryan world order, a *pax Aryana*, as a prerequisite for the attainment of the long-term racial goals of the Movement. From the spring of 1959, this concept had existed on paper as the “World Union of Free-Enterprise National Socialists,” but until the summer of 1962 it was not implemented beyond an exchange of letters with individual National Socialists in Europe. In early August, 1962, Rockwell met with National Socialist representatives from four other nations in the Cotswold Hills, near Cotswold, England, and the World Union of National Socialists formally came into existence. On the fifth of August the protocol now known as the Cotswold Agreements was drawn up, pledging the National Socialist movements of the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany (including Austria), and Belgium to a common effort. Annual meetings of the World Union of National Socialists were originally envisaged, but Fate and circumstances prevented this. Rockwell was under increasing pressure in America during the next five years, as the situation there grew steadily more turbulent.

Rockwell’s original program was divided into three phases. The first phase, beginning in March, 1959, was to be a phase of provocative but essentially non-constructive activity, intended to generate publicity and build a public image, no matter how distorted. The second phase was to be a cadre-building phase, during which a strong, disciplined, effective, professional National Socialist organization was to be built and capabilities in propaganda and organizing developed to a high degree. The third phase was to be one of mass organization.

Phase one was masterfully executed. Rockwell proved himself an outstanding tactician in the rough-and-tumble game of smashing through the Jewish blackout barrier. With cool objectivity, he watched the press heap bucket after bucket of lies and filth on his image,

provoking them to renewed activity whenever they tired. With keen insight he analyzed the Jewish situation. He understood that though they occupied the key positions of control in the public-opinion-forming networks, they were constrained to a large extent by the fact that that control must remain hidden from the public.

Furthermore, he understood the fact that a very substantial portion of the reporters, editors, columnists, newscasters, and even many individual newspaper and broadcast-station owners are not Jews, and, barring direct and categorical orders to the contrary from the key Jews, these people can be counted upon to react in a more-or-less predictable way to a given stimulus. Thus, by taking a position and making statements which seemed extreme and even ridiculous to the “average citizen,” he could entice publicists to quote him widely, thinking thus to discredit both the man and the philosophy with these average citizens. What they failed to understand was that before the Movement could profit from any mass appeal, it had to appeal to a large number of very un-average citizens—fearless idealists who could form the National Socialist cadre.

And these men responded in a very different way to Rockwell’s message than did the liberal publicists or their average audience. They saw beyond the superficial “ridiculousness” of his message to the kernel of deep truth that it contained. While the average citizen, incapable of thinking beyond the immediate problems of the day, found Rockwell’s message “too extreme,” just as the publicists intended, those who could extrapolate in their minds the developments of the present to the consequences of tomorrow—and of a century hence—saw the compelling necessity of his demands. But such men are rather sparsely distributed throughout the population, and to reach them Rockwell needed to cast his net very wide; this the publicists helped him do while they thought to smear him. Rockwell also understood that the image of him being erected in the minds of the masses, while a liability now, had a value for the future, when conditions had ripened so that at least some of those masses were ready for an “extremist.”

Phase two—cadre building and organizational development—in a sense was co-extant with phase one, for from the very beginning Rockwell’s publicity began to attract a few of the idealists needed for phase two, and these men began to constitute the skeleton of the organizational structure which was later to be filled out. Even a bit of phase three entered the picture during the first phase, when Rockwell conducted a campaign to become governor of the state of Virginia in 1965.

This election campaign proved to be a period of extremely valuable training not only for Rockwell but for the leadership personnel of his entire Party. Realizing the eventual need to develop proficiency at mass campaigning, Rockwell decided to begin acquiring experience in that direction soon rather than late. As he later admitted, after winning less than 1.5% of the votes cast, the campaign also provided a more fundamental lesson and helped him to realistically re-evaluate the entire status of the Movement. Before, he had taken overly optimistic view that the Movement would begin to pick up substantial mass

following as soon as it had gained sufficient publicity through his phase-one activities; that is, he believed that phases two and three would be largely concurrent.

After the Virginia campaign, having been reminded once again of the stupendous inertia of public opinion, he realized that phase two would be much longer than originally anticipated, and that the beginning of any substantial success from phase-three activity would have to await two things: a considerable internal strengthening of the Movement and a considerable worsening of the general racial-social-economic situation.

With this first thing in mind, he made the decision in 1966 to inaugurate a general activity. As mentioned before, the first two phases of Party activity overlapped to a large extent, and the transition between the two was marked primarily by a shift of emphasis. Phase one was the “Nazi” era of the Movement. Phase two is the beginning of the National Socialist era. In line with this re-emphasis, the American Nazi Party officially became the National Socialist White People’s Party on January 1, 1967, and that date can reasonably be considered to mark the transition. Six months earlier, the appearance of *National Socialist World* was a major step in this direction. And six months after that date—in June, 1967—a historic re-organizational conference of the Party leadership was held in Arlington. There Rockwell set the Movement on its new course, explaining the need for a total professionalization of every activity, from fund raising to propaganda writing, in order to meet the severe demands to be expected during the long period of growth and struggle ahead.

He was now forty-nine years old. For the past eight years he had been working an average sixteen hours a day, seven days a week. The strain on his physical and spiritual resources had been severe. Usually he was obliged to concentrate on the several tasks simultaneously. There was always a demonstration to be planned, a speech to be prepared, propaganda to be written, a court case to be fought, money to be raised, and everything to be done under nearly impossible working conditions, with incessant interruptions. Only the immense vitality of his rugged, six-foot-four-inch frame and a deep reserve of spiritual strength had sustained him in the past.

The course that lay ahead would certainly be no easier; on the contrary, in addition to the old tasks connected with agitation and publicity, there would be many new problems to be faced as the Movement continued into its new phase of activity.

Other men—strong men—might have yielded to the temptation to remain with a prescription to which they had become accustomed and not venture from a beaten path into strange and difficult territory. The slightest trace of subjectivity would allow them to ring forth a hundred reasons for not changing a *modus operandi* which they had found successful in the past. And yet it was characteristic of Rockwell that he did not hesitate for an instant. When he saw that the time had come for the Movement to change its tactics

and accept a different set of challenges, he set himself to the new task with the same determination that he had shown throughout the first phase.

Now it was necessary to build up a whole new public image for the Party, or, rather, gradually to transform the grossly distorted image he had induced the enemy to build for him to one closer to the truth. It was a demanding task, and he spent the summer of 1967 in laying plans for the future and in finishing his new book, *White Power*.

On the 25th of August, 1967, a Friday, at two minutes before noon, near his Arlington headquarters, an assassin's bullet struck him down.

Following a denial by the United States government of Commander Rockwell's right to burial in a national cemetery, his Party comrades had his body cremated, and a National Socialist memorial service was held in Arlington on the afternoon of August 30. His eulogy was short but moving:

The stunning suddenness of his departure and the ensuing turmoil of the last few days have kept us from yet assessing the magnitude of our loss.

He saw further than other men, and he fought harder...

And so long as that Movement remains and that idea continues to fill the hearts and minds of men, the spirit of Lincoln Rockwell lives on.

For it was he, Lincoln Rockwell, who again picked up the torch which fell to earth twenty-two years ago. Adolf Hitler founded our great Movement and will forever fill a unique position in the saga of our race; but had it not been for Lincoln Rockwell, Adolf Hitler's mighty work might well have been in vain. It was Lincoln Rockwell who set us once again on the upward path when we had faltered and wanted to go back again.

Editor's note

Pierce's piece is undated on the internet sites that reproduce it. Only a few sentences of the eulogy in the previous page have been reproduced above. The US judiciary system did not condemn the assassin, John Patler, to either death penalty or life sentence.

National Socialist worldview

by Heinrich Himmler



The development of German culture has not followed a steadily rising course. Decades of no growth are followed by periods of slow but steady progress, then new ideas suddenly appear that transform our culture in fundamental ways. A new view of the world opens up, giving us entirely new ideas of our nature and our environment that can only gradually be investigated. They give our people the opportunity for new growth, new flowering, new possibilities.

The 15th and 16th centuries during the Middle Ages were a period when the Nordic spirit found characteristic expression in the Copernicus' teaching that the earth revolved around the sun. The earth, which formerly was thought to be the center of the universe, became a small planet that was just as subject to the harmony of eternal laws as the course of the

stars. The former world of appearances collapsed, and the Nordic spirit opened the door to a new scientific worldview. As a result of his revolutionary discovery, the worldview the Medieval Church had so successfully built to control people's minds gradually fell apart over the following centuries. Today's scientifically-based worldview freed us from the spiritual domination of the priesthood. We owe to it our great advances in technology, the sciences, and economics.

Today we are in the middle of another revolutionary epoch. Revolutionary scientific understandings of genetics and race have found political expression in the National Socialist world view. Once again a world of appearances collapsed, which had concealed from our eyes the true nature of humanity and the connections between body, soul, and spirit.

The foundation of the Christian worldview is the doctrine of the separation of body and soul; the soul and spirit belong to a world independent of the physical, free of natural laws, and they are even to a certain degree able to free the human body from its natural setting.

It is a major shift when racial theory recognizes the unity of body, soul and spirit and sees them as a whole that follows the eternal laws of nature.

A new epoch is coming, one perhaps even more revolutionary than that resulting from Copernicus's work. Ideas about humanity and peoples that have endured for millennia are collapsing. The Nordic spirit is struggling to free itself from the chains that the Church and the Jews have imposed on Germandom. And it is not only a spiritual battle, for it finds expression in National Socialism's struggle for power, as well as in today's battlefields to the east and west. The coming victory will bring a fundamental change in our view of the world, and opens the way for Nordic mankind to a new and greater future.

The enemies of the National Socialist worldview and their doctrine of the equality of humanity

The Churches

The Christian Church taught the equality of humanity from the beginning, and realized it in the areas it dominated. The Jew Paul was above all responsible for the idea, despite his pride in his pure Jewish ancestry. He won the inhabitants of the Roman Empire for the new faith.

The Roman Empire experienced considerable racial mixing, which encouraged the rapid spread of the doctrine of racial equality. Anyone could become a Christian, whether Roman, Greek, Jew, Negro, etc. As Christians they were all the same, for the important thing was that they belonged to the Church and accepted its teachings. The only differences that counted were those between believers and unbelievers, and between priests and the laity within the Church. Since all men were created in God's image, all needed to be won for the Church. The goal is a unified humanity united in an all-encompassing Church led by the priests. The clearest expression of this comes in Pope Pius IX's statement on 29 July 1938: "One forgets today that the human race is a single, large and catholic race."

This religious doctrine did not come from the native religion of a race or of a racially pure people. It developed in the Orient during a period of racial chaos from the most varied cultures and found its final form under Byzantine influence.



Does the same soul dwell in these differing bodies?

Being absorbed into the Christian community and receiving Christian education did nothing to change or improve the nature or life styles of the various peoples, however. They were only rendered uncertain of their true nature, meaning that foreign influences interfered in areas where only blood should speak, for example the relations between men and women, spousal selection, the relationship between family and people, indeed in relations to foreign customs and life styles.

In over a thousand years, Christianity has not succeeded in raising the cultural level of Negroes or South American Indians. But the Church has built walls where none should exist, for example those between Germans of varying confessions. And it has torn down walls that nature established by blessing marriages between Aryans and Jews, Negroes and Mongols. It took millions of valuable people from their god-ordained roles in the people's

community and put them in monasteries or the priesthood. Its doctrines are responsible for the fall of races, peoples and cultures.

The healthy instincts of the German peoples resisted its foreign teaching from the beginning, or tried to give it its own stamp. Nordic people fought against it for centuries. Meister Elkhart said over 600 years ago: "The divine is in me, I am a part of it; I can recognize God's will without the help of priests." Luther told Christians to listen to themselves and act according to their consciences. But the tragedy of the Reformation is that began as a German revolution, but ended in a battle over dogmas, and Luther finally bound the conscience to the Jewish teachings of the Bible.

Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo and many other scientists began the battle between modern science and Church dogma. The Nordic scientific spirit can only accept as true what is in accord with science and experience. Today even the once immovable Church is asking questions about the equality of humanity. The National Socialist worldview, based on the knowledge of the laws of inheritance and the inequality of the races, will succeed in overcoming this ancient false teaching and return the German people to its native worldview.

Liberalism

The French Revolution (1789) introduced Europe to a new guiding idea, summarized in the phrase "Freedom, Equality, Brotherhood."

It was an uprising of racially inferior elements who took over ideas that in part had entirely different racial origins, and could only be perverted by them. The Jews had a decisive influence.

Like the Church, liberalism taught that all people were equal; that there were no value differences between the races; that external differences (e.g., body type, skin color) were unimportant. Each person, regardless of race, might be a hero or a coward, an idealist or a materialist, creative or useless to society, militarily able, scientifically able, artistically gifted. The environment and education were the important elements that made men good and valuable. If one provided the proper environment and freed people from their chains, the peoples would join to develop their abilities in a unified humanity, and eternal peace would result. Therefore liberalism demanded equality for all, the same opportunities for everyone, in particular the Jews, equality and freedom in the economic sphere, etc.

We Germans have seen where such doctrines lead. Liberalism tore down the structures that held races and peoples together, releasing the destructive drives. The result was economic chaos that led to millions of unemployed on the one side and the senseless luxury of economic jackals on the other. Liberalism destroyed the people's economic

foundations, allowing the triumph of sub-humans. They won the leading role in the political parties, the economy, the sciences, arts and press, hollowing out the nation from inside. The equality of all citizens, regardless of race, led to the mixing of Europeans with Jews, Negro, Mongols, and so on, resulting in the decay and decline of the Aryan race.

All that Nordic civilization had won from the powers of darkness in the areas of culture, science, and freedom was threatened at the instant when the Jews and other inferior elements gained power. European domination of the world collapsed as the result of the World War, and the best of the Germanic peoples, the Germans, faced the danger of decline. Adolf Hitler alone rescued Germany and all of Europe from this fate.

Marxism

The most dangerous opponent of our worldview at present is Marxism, and its offspring Bolshevism. It is a product of the destructive Jewish spirit, and it is primarily Jews who have transformed this destructive idea into reality. Marxism teaches that there are only two classes: the owners and the property-less. Each must be destroyed and all differences between people must be abolished; a single human soup must result. That which formerly was holy is held in contempt. Every connection to family, clan and people was dissolved. Marxism appeals to humanity's basest drives; it is an appeal to sub-humans.

We have seen firsthand where Marxism leads people, in Germany from 1919 to 1932, in Spain and above all in Russia. The people corrupted by Liberalism are not able to defend themselves against this Jewish-Marxist poison. If Adolf Hitler had not won the battle for the soul of his people and destroyed Marxism, Europe would have sunk into Bolshevik chaos. The war in the East will lead to the final elimination of Bolshevism; the victory of the National Socialist worldview is the victory of Aryan culture over the spirit of destruction, the victory of life over death.

The Jew

The Jews were behind the teachings of equality by the Church, Liberalism and Marxism. They were the first and most fanatic proponents of the idea. The Jew Paul spread the Christian doctrine of equality. Freemasonry dominated the intellectual world of the French Revolution, and Liberalism grew out of Freemasonry. The Portuguese Jew Ricardo, the "father of classical national economics," is the prophet of the liberal economic theory of free trade and economic piracy. The foundation of Marxism and Bolshevism is *Das Kapital*, by the Jew Mardochai (Marx).

How did the Jew gain this destructive power over the European peoples? The Jews are a mixed race. The essential characteristic that separates them from all other races and peoples is the instinct for parasitism.

The Jews themselves are most clear about this. Karl Marx, the author of *Das Kapital* says:

What is the essential trait of Jewry? Practicality, self-interest.

What is the culture of the Jew? Haggling.

What is his God? Money.

The Jewish philosopher Spinoza said: “What we require is simple: that we control everything necessary for our own good.”

The parasitic nature of the Jews is clear in its ability to adjust to the host peoples. A characteristic example is the relationship of the Jew to language: Even before our era the Jewish people had changed its language several times. Wherever they went, they took on the host language, though they were generally unable to conceal their racial additions.

Yet the Jews are one of the most racially conscious peoples. The laws of the Old Testament and the Talmud strongly prohibit marriage with non-Jews. Leading Jews have always stressed the importance of race and racial purity. Even the Soviet Union, otherwise opposed to race, had passed measures to protect Jewish blood.

The most familiar statement comes from the Jew Benjamin Disraeli (originally d’Israeli, later Lord Beaconsfield), the longtime British prime minister:

No one may be indifferent to the racial principle, the racial question. It is the key to world history. History is often confusing because it is written by people who did not understand the racial question and the aspects relevant to it... Race is everything, and every race that does not keep its blood from being mixed will perish... Language and religion do not determine a race—blood determines it.

His parasitic nature led the Jew to hold his own race pure, and to strike other races at the core of their being, their racial nature. Only when a people’s racial purity has been destroyed is the Jew able to develop freely and without restraint.

Disraeli’s political policies prove that many Jews consciously work to destroy racial purity. He made Queen Elizabeth Empress of India, creating an opening in England for oriental life styles. He misled the English people with the notion of an Oriental Empire, thereby dulling and falsifying English racial instincts. The Jew also betrayed the peoples of Russia with images of heaven on earth, leading to race mixing to a vast degree, greatly speeding up a process of decay already in progress.

The Jew could realize his plans for world domination only when Russia had become weak, without instincts, without culture. That is how we understand Mommsen’s description of the Jewish people as the “ferment of decomposition.” As a result, there can never be

peace, but only combat, between the Jew and racially aware peoples. Europe will have defeated this threat only when the last Jew has left our part of the planet. The Führer's words at the beginning of the war will be fulfilled: The German people will not be destroyed in this war, but rather the Jew.

The racial question as the decisive question for our people

Whenever the existence of a people is threatened, the foundation of their development and rise becomes important. The history of every great nation shows a clear idea of its uniqueness and a rejection of foreign races. This attitude is as innate in people as it is in animals. This becomes problematic only when peoples disobey god-ordained laws, when the destructive ideas of equality destroy their instincts, when racial mixing develops. It is then usually too late to turn around, and the decline of the peoples can no longer be stopped. Warning voices were raised in the 18th and 19th centuries when Liberalism began to destroy the peoples of Europe. Gobineau recognized with sure perceptiveness the danger of race mixing. H. St. Chamberlain followed him, as did many others, above all F. K. Günter, who wrote *The Racial Nature of the German People*.

We owe these Nordic scientists this revolutionary knowledge: Humanity is not equal. Just as plants and animals are of different types, so, too, are people. Each of these types inherits certain characteristics, which distinguish it from all other types, from all other races. Racial differences are physical, spiritual, and intellectual. The most important differences are in the spiritual and intellectual areas, in life styles. Racial science is further supported by advances in genetics. Nordic scientists probed ever deeper into the secrets of life and nature. Gregor Mendel was the first to discover the laws of genetics, opening the way to understanding one of God's greatest secrets, the nature and continuation of life.

Genetics tells us that characteristics are passed unaltered from generation to generation, and that spiritual and other characteristics are inherited along with physical ones. The environment can only influence what is already present in the genes. Unlike animals, a person does not have a single environment, but also lives in the cultural world of his race and people. This too determines the development of his inherited traits. His culture comes from his inheritance. Therefore, the race to which we belong determines the life we are born into, and the life we pass on.

Racial differences

Races differ not only in their natures, but also in their values. Some races have great creative gifts; others over the centuries never raise themselves above the most primitive level. Think of the fruitful plains of the Ukraine, and imagine what German industry and German ability could have done with them! Compare them with the sandy soil of Mark Brandenburg. The smallest village there displays a culture that towers over Bolshevism's model cities and collective farms.



Caption: A Russian Village in the fertile Ukraine, a German farm on land wrested from the sea. The environment does not form people—people form the environment.

The accomplishments of the Nordic race are the highest of any race in Europe. This is shown in many splendid cultural monuments, not only on European soil, but also deep in Asia and Africa. The investigations are at an early stage, but we already know that there is hardly a nation in North Africa, the Near East, Iran, India and as far as Turkistan that does not show wonderful evidence of Nordic cultures. It must fill us with pride that in our own homeland, in Germany, culture has bloomed in unbroken lines for more than 5000 years, created by people of our blood, our nature, our ancestry.

Race is the decisive force in the life of the peoples

Race is the decisive and molding force in the life of the nations. Language, culture, customs, piety, traditions, life style, but also laws, governmental forms and economies, the whole variety of life is racially determined.

Only racially higher peoples are creators and bearers of a high culture. Only they determine the course of events. Inferior races have no history. They lack the necessary ability, the ability to master their own fate. Only racially advanced peoples have this ability; races that do not have the courage to make history have no history. The life of a people does not develop mechanically, nor does it develop steadily. It is a constant struggle with nature and the environment, and above all with other peoples. It is an eternal battle, an eternal struggle. There is no unified, gradual development of all peoples to a common goal. Cultures rise and fall and peoples vanish without others being able to build on their foundation. Each people have unique racial elements that determine its life style and culture, elements that only it can develop and fill with new life.

Peoples are creative and significant only as long as they preserve and keep pure their racial inheritance. The decline of a people's culture is always the result of race mixing and a decline in racial quality. Any change in the racial makeup of a people leads to a change in its nature and its culture. If the race that gave a people its nature is debased by mixing with foreign and inferior races, the people's culture will perish and can never again be restored to full life.

A philosophy that assumes human equality and teaches that all of humanity is part of a common, step-by-step process of development is an error or else a conscious lie. There is no common development of all of humanity. The results of all serious investigations provide evidence against this viewpoint.

It is equally false to think that cultures, like individual organisms, follow the laws of growth and decline—that every culture must eventually perish. History provides many examples of peoples that endure for millennia, reaching ever new levels, as long as they maintain their racial purity. Only those peoples perish that ignore their culture—those who act against the law of blood, those that do not maintain the purity of the leading and guiding race.

Since the rise or fall of a people's culture depends above all on the maintenance, care, and purity of its valuable racial inheritance, every responsible statesman must be concerned with racial policy, and do everything possible to maintain the purity of the racial inheritance for the future. Adolf Hitler was the first statesman in history to recognize this and base his policies on it. The world-spanning war that the German people are waging under his leadership is the battle of the Nordic Race against the forces of chaos and racial decay. It is decisive for the future of our Germanic culture, for the purity of the racial elements that make our culture, and for the fate of Europe as a whole.

The triumph of racial thinking

When National Socialism took power in Germany, most citizens did not understand the revolutionary significance of racial science and genetics. The victory of racial thinking in so short a time is astonishing. Scientific knowledge often requires decades, even centuries, to enter a people's thinking. The worldview Adolf Hitler developed, based on these incontrovertible scientific results, enabled the greater part of our people to be persuaded of the correctness and decisive significance of racial thinking.

Even in other parts of the Germanic world where the influence of Liberalism has been the strongest and most persistent (e.g. Sweden) people are realizing the historical significance and value of common Nordic blood and the importance of keeping it pure. They recognize that even today the North Germanic peoples are endangered.

Each of Europe's peoples must return to the source of its existence and affirm its racial uniqueness if it is to be renewed in the way the German people has been under National Socialism.

In recent years, most European peoples have found the will to protect their racial purity against mixing. The Jews are increasingly excluded from economic life, and marriages with Jews are forbidden. Examples are Slovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Croatia, and Bulgaria.

Adolf Hitler introduced a new era in the history of Europe and the world. A new world is rising. The barriers of centuries are falling. Empires are declining and a new order under the leadership of young people is rising. The spiritual revolution of our age is just as significant. The spiritual and political boundaries have probably never been clearer than they are today. The lines are clear everywhere.

The Second World War is a struggle between two worldviews and two ways of life. Our enemy hates us because we have recognized that the single raw material that cannot be replaced is the raw material that the German people have more of than any other people on earth, our good blood, which is our Nordic inheritance. They hate us because they know that we hold the key to victory, to our future, and to the eternal Reich of all Germans.

Source: Der Reichsführer SS/*SS-Hauptamt, Rassenpolitik*
(Berlin, 1943 [?]).

Letter from Manu

Dear César:

I have been reading the articles related to the anniversary of Hitler that have been posted, and they made me think about my critical attitude with respect to Hitler.

In this time of defeat, this interregnum as you put it somewhere, in this night we all suffer, it is not prudent nor wise the throwing from our ranks the slightest criticism of the Nazi period (we cannot give weapons to the enemy). Moreover, it is the only relevant event of our people in the last thousands of years, I would say.

Certainly this anniversary, the articles, but also your words have made me rethink this whole period. In this period the Aryan people is identified and recognized for the first time in the history of the peoples. For the first time our people became conscious of itself, about its origin and its nature. Since the rise of our people (that primitive nucleus) six or seven thousand years ago, there was nothing like it. It was a dawn, a new dawn. They were sublime moments.

This birth has to do with the emergence of Indo-European studies, and studies of evolution and genetics of that time. They spread new knowledge about our bio-cultural being, about our race, and our languages and cultures. It was a recognition. It was like looking for the first time in a mirror. We were there in those texts: in the hymns of the *Rig Veda*, in the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid*, in the *Edda*, the *Mabinogion*... It was us, our blood, our genius, our race, which had generated those texts, those cultures, those worlds.

The swastika, our banner, was not only raised against liberalism and communism... Just today we begin to understand the greatness and scope of its mission, and our mission. To situate it accurately we can make ours these words of Saint-Loup (the first aphorism of *Quotations*):

[Hitler était] l'homme qui avait jeté au monde ce prodigieux défi : attaquer en même temps le capitalisme anglo-saxon, le bolchevisme rouge, le racisme juif, la franc-maçonnerie internationale, l'Eglise catholique, le paupérisme et les iniquités sociales, le traité de Versailles, le colonialisme, la pagaille française et la Home Fleet.

[Hitler was] the man who had thrown to the world this extraordinary challenge: to attack at the same time Anglo-Saxon capitalism, Red Bolshevism, Jewish racism, international Freemasonry, the Catholic Church, pauperism and social iniquities, the Treaty of Versailles, colonialism, the French mess, and the Home Fleet.

And the list is not complete.

It was not just Hitler, but Germany as a whole: the entire German people. It was a collective “enterprise.”

Born armed, like Athena, the German community, was the first Aryan community to wake up, or being reborn. And it does it to fight those who have sought her harm; against an entire counter-cultural environment which negates her being. Spiritually alienated she has to fight against the Jewish-messianic delusion, the “Christian millennium.” And it was not the only Jewish monster that had to face this newborn Aryan nation: communism also thrived, ravaging the population, and others. The Jewish hydra had multiplied, had branched, had too many faces, too many heads.

It seems that we have had but one enemy along the history, the Semitic peoples and their speeches (Jews, Judeo-Messianics, and Muslims). They dominate us spiritually. It's the multiple alienation we suffer at the hands of Semites or Semitic ideologies (religious, political, economic, anthropological, sociological, psychological...). Our enemy possess us one way or the other. The frightening Jewish hydra. Typhon. Evil. Our evil.

Was it an awakening, a premature birth? Too young was this community to face this millenary Monster. As a young Hero he failed in his first attempt to defeat it. Too old and cunning was such monstrosity. It gobbled up the boy, and the young Aryan community, in a few years.

It was the first attempt, nothing more: the first real combat. Until then we had been suffering its impositions and strategies without even realizing that we were being attacked. They had thousands of years depriving us of our things, denying our ancestral being, vituperating our ancestors, defiling our sacred places, dividing us, sowing discord among us. It should be noted the Judeo-Messianic dualism (Manichaeism) of their holy book in (Old Testament and New Testament), but also in Marxism, or psychoanalysis. The spread of these ideologies is part of their domination strategy.

We are a young people, a young race. We lack experience. This interregnum must serve to strengthen us spiritually and culturally.

You say, in a comment on the Johnson article, that the “revisionism” of Hitler and the Nazi period is essential. I absolutely agree. The Nazi period as a whole (from birth until its fall) has to be reclaimed for several reasons. It is essential in our history, in the history of

the Aryan peoples. This is our new birth, our first encounter with the ancient Enemy, and our first loss. Nothing more or less. This episode has to have absolute preeminence among us. It must occupy the highest place in our memory, in our thoughts, in our hearts.

We have to rescue the memory of this period and raise it to the top with pride. We must be proud of that period. We were beaten, but not defeated. We are still alive and active. If we do not defeat it in the next battle, we will win the next one. We will overcome them at last. I know that.

The birth of our people is conceived in the years before Hitler came to power. The Aryan consciousness of a whole people then saw the light, and received his “baptism” publicly. An entire people recognized itself. 1933 is the year of their birth: the first Aryan community recognized as such. Their loss occurs in 1945. We are, therefore, on the 80th anniversary of their birth, the birth of the first Aryan nation, of the Aryan nation itself.

That period is a milestone unmatched in our short history. The first appearance of our people in History. Now we are a people: the Aryan nation.

Hitler symbolizes our first period, our first battle, and our first loss. His struggle was our struggle. His loss was our loss. But this defeat has not conquered us during our first open confrontation against evil, against our evil. We were defeated, so what? It was huge the thing against which they fought. Too many hydra tentacles. It could not be. Next time we overcome, or the next one. The war has just begun.

These anniversaries of Hitler and the birth of our people have been for me as a small renaissance too. Let’s say I see more light, I see clearer. I have a presentiment of the next battle—that there will be a next battle. And this time we will have a space from which to advance, a bulwark, a solid footing: the Aryan nation itself. We shall re-conquer our people. We have many great spiritual warriors, and well armed with knowledge and truth. In the end, we will win.

This is my spirit now. We’re already a people.

César, I feel that I owed you this letter and all those I upset with my previous words about Hitler and the Nazi period.

Regards,

Manu Rodríguez

The West’s Darkest Hour (April 26, 2013, translated from Spanish).

- Final report -

Why I am not a neonazi

Virtually all white males have been brainwashed about what really happened in the Second World War.

To boot, they have been feminized: characterologically they are basically the very antipodes of Himmler's SS men. Even most white nationalists are reluctant to repudiate the conquests of feminism, starting not only with allowing women to vote (we have implied that democracy is the worst kind of political system) but even with their "right" to inherit wealth or property.

The humiliating empowerment of white women throughout the West is directly proportionate with the cretinization of white males. However, now that I reproduced my translations of a book about the prime example of polar Yang in our history, Sparta, I would like to qualify that what we need is Aristotle's proverbial golden mean. Sparta produced the best soldiers in world history but perished because it ignored what we now know: that enslaving non-whites is fatal in the long run. What we need is the Hegelian synthesis between yang Sparta and yin Athens: a sort of modern Rome.

That is exactly what National Socialism was all about. Inspired in Rome, and let us remember the virile Roman salute, the Third Reich incorporated and eliminated—Hegel's *aufheben*—the contradictions in both extremes: it was highly cultured as well as a tough military state.

I consider myself a spiritual inheritor of the Nationalist Socialist legacy. But I reject neonazism. Why?

Because neonazis are basically white nationalists plus Nazi paraphernalia. We have already seen that, unlike the NS men, these groups love degenerate music, Judaized Hollywood and non-reproductive sex. Many of these *décadents* are also anti-Nordicists who would dismiss a command cited in the very first lesson of Stellrecht's *Faith and Action* already

quoted in previous pages: “But if your blood has traits that will make your children unhappy and burdens to the state, then you have the heroic duty to be the last.”

It may seem hilarious to say it here but there are some neonazis in Mexico—mestizos! Some of them live their “Nazi” lifestyles under the delusion that they are whites. Of course, I have zero friends among these poor bastards. They would never consider Stellrecht’s advice for the Hitler Youth, which should apply to them far more. I confess that my only friend in Latin America is the Brazilian Larry Mars, a true believer in the fourteen words whom I have quoted in this book. Unlike the neonazis Mars does indeed believe that his duty is to be the last of his line, insofar as he concedes he is not properly white.


Mexican clowns aside, the surreal thing is that even the pure Aryans hate Nordicism. Conversely what I love about Himmler is that, precisely because he was not handsome, he admired the hyper-Nordics of a Norwegian town he visited and harbored the thought that its people could be a paradigm for the Reich. Remember Stubb’s words about white nationalists:

Not only does it [Nordicism in general and *real* National Socialism in particular] retrigger all the anti-racist conditioning they thought they’d gotten rid of, but it makes them ask “where does it end?” “At what point can we finally stop paying attention to each others genetic (and non-genetic) flaws?”

The answer is that it doesn’t end: that all life is struggle and hierarchy and that the Aryan race will never be perfected nor entirely freed from threats. But that’s not what they want to hear. Pierce made eugenics the core of his religious outlook as a means of protecting the eugenically-selecting society. But I see little concern for the subject among modern white nationalists. Can you imagine a racial state with a comprehensive eugenic policy which *didn’t* consider the reversal of mongrelization to be a major objective? [Stellrecht’s “heroic” advice] That it *wouldn’t* make its population look more like Swedes and less like Sicilians, as time goes on? It’s hard to do so, which is why I believe “anti-Nordicism” in white nationalism has, among other things, shut down much of the discussion on the subject.

On September 2013, in Harold Covington’s Northwest Front blogsite, several commenters subscribed politically correctness by bashing Covington in order not to offend the feelings of contemporary Greeks. A saner Northwest Front commenter said, “Those among us who don’t have the ability to look at a picture of half-Turks and tell they’re not White weren’t ever going to amount to anything on behalf of the White race.” The other side, the “revolutionary” neonazis, ignored that DNA tests have even revealed nigger genes among quite a few of the Portuguese; and we have already seen El Greco’s painting of crossbreed Spaniards as well as Pierce’s statement that “a 5 percent decline in average IQ would cause our civilization to collapse,” which applies to Sicily and Greece even before the Turkish invasion.

This cowardly lack of recognition of the very *Letter A* in Indo-European studies is not the only thing that annoys me about the embryonic movement known as white nationalism. Over the internet boards I find it bothersome when typical neonazis demand that I dismiss the Holocaust stories as hoax; and that if I fail to do it my morals are beyond the pale.



David Irving in 2012

As someone who has spent many years studying controversial subjects (the pseudoscience in both parapsychology and biological psychiatry), I know perfectly that you must spend at least a decade of your life trying to digest the scholarly literature of both sides of an academic debate. I am in my middle fifties now and don't have the time nor the motivation to research the Holocaust claims and counter-claims. For me it is enough to point out that two former Holocaust revisionists, Mark Weber, the director of the Institute of Historical Review, and David Irving, our best historian of the Third Reich, have changed their minds over the years, both accepting now that a few millions of Jews probably died during the war. According to an email of March 16, 2014 sent to me by Irving himself, his book on Herr Himmler will be released later in this year. Irving's forthcoming book quotes historical records proving that, even though the six-million figure is an invention, a few millions of Jews probably died as a result of harsh Nazi treatments.

But I would like to go beyond Irving's scruples. Joseph Walsh has stated in my blogsite that "The Truth is that the glad stirrings of genocide lurk in the heart of *every man*, yet only the Nazis had the courage to acknowledge the Truth." Panina, a Swede that in 2012 used to comment in my blogsite, went even further:

What is certain is that the Holocaust would not have produced any debilitating psychological effect on non-Christian whites. (By Christianity I mean "Christian

morality.” Most atheists in the West are still Christian, even if they don’t believe in God or Jesus.) Being emotionally affected by the Holocaust presupposes that you think:

- 1) Victims and losers have intrinsically more moral value than conquerors and winners
- 2) Killing is the most horrendous thing a human can do
- 3) Killing children and women is even more horrendous
- 4) Every human life has the same value

None of these statements ring true to a man who rejected Christian morality. In fact, even if the Holocaust happened, I would not pity the victims or sympathize with them.

If you told the Vikings that they needed to accept Jews on their lands or give them gold coins because six million of them were exterminated in an obscure war, they would have laughed at you.

It must be comical for the Nietzscheans of the North that, unlike the monocausalism ubiquitously present in the neonazi and white nationalist movement, Himmler acknowledged other factors: “Our people’s thinking was misled by the forces of the Church, Liberalism, Bolshevism, and Jewry.” And let us never forget Hitler’s own words in one of his table talks: “The heaviest blow that ever struck humanity was the coming of Christianity.” If neonazis were true Nazis and had transvalued Christian/Neo-Christian values they would be trying to demonstrate that Himmler’s Posen Speech in 1943 is *genuine*, not a hoax as they claim, and even find genocidal inspiration from the speech.

Of course: they will never do it because all of them are Neo-Christian pseudo-Nazis. Speaking with a little humor I would say that neonazis, white nationalists, and American southern nationalists subscribe what we may call the Harry Potter approach to the Jewish problem. Throughout those novels for children, the female author presents us a Harry who never uses “Avara Kadavra,” the killing spell against the bad guys; Harry only uses the disarming charm, “Expelliarmus.” But only in novels and movies for kids the good guys, who never are depicted as cold assassins, can win. In real life you have to make a transition to the dark side, to Himmler’s ways, to become a soldier.

I have read *The Turner Diaries* twice. When I read it for the first time, or rather listened the audio version with Pierce’s own voice, I was still struggling with the last remnants my Neo-Christian programming. I didn’t like the Breivik-like cruelties: for example the killing of an innocent black—the first killing of the novel—or the dispatching of an entire group of pro-white warriors for not taking care of the Jewish problem in Toronto. And in the novel’s Day of the Rope I was troubled by the description that many innocent young

women also die. Then I read most of Covington's *Quintet* and sensed a moral difference. Covington's characters are not so bloodthirsty, not so genocidal exterminators. I could imagine myself doing the things in Covington's novels but in the past some passages of the *Diaries* made me wonder...

But now that I have definitively left behind Christian axiology I can see that Pierce was ultimately right. As NS soldiers in the coming racial wars, altogether imbued in the martial qualities of gravitas and severitas, we must behave. The huge difference between the *Quintet* and the *Diaries* is that in Pierce's world not only an ethno-state is born: in the final pages it is described that only the white race shall inherit the Earth. In Covington's world *that* is dismissed because it would mean genocide on a scale not even performed by the Bolshevik Jews. But as Pierce said in *Who We Are*, already cited way above:

The hard lesson taught by the different results of the European colonization of North America, Latin America, Australia, New Zealand, India, and southern Africa is that the only type of colonization with lasting significance is racial colonization; and that racial colonization can succeed only when Whites are willing and able to clear the land of non-White inhabitants and keep it clear.

This item of both *Who We Are* and the *Diaries* is so strong meat that I will elaborate on it only in *Day of Wrath*, a book reproducing my essays already available in *The West's Darkest Hour*.

Feminist quotas in the Northwest Front

Rockwell was assassinated in 1967; Pierce died of natural death, more than thirty years later. None of them were properly white nationalists. ("White nationalism" is a term introduced in the middle 1990s for the internet.) Their worldview was much closer to the thoroughgoing Yang reaction in National Socialism against the feminizing forces of degeneracy.

Presently in the American racialist scene Harold Covington, called "The Kid" in the times of Rockwell and Pierce, is considered the most radical ("Yang") element as ideologically he is a revolutionary, not a mere reactionary. But Covington does not believe that millions of Jews died as a result of harsh treatment by the National Socialist Germans. Unlike Panina, Walsh and a few others, he is stuck in Neo-Christian values. (I would dare to say that the stirrings of genocide should lurk in the heart of *every transvalued white*, which means accepting as grim necessity what seventy years ago happened to the subversive tribe.) As already said, in Covington's quintet the purpose is not to reconquer the whole United States for the race, but to form an ethnostate within a few Northwestern states by means of secession; leaving the rest of the US territory to the blacks, mestizos, Jews, and white

traitors. In fact, in Covington's plan the nuclear weapons of mass destruction are left in the power of the federal government of the United States!

In more than two thousand pages the plots of Covington's quintet—*The Brigade*, *A Distant Thunder*, *A Mighty Fortress*, *The Hill of the Ravens* and *Freedom's Sons*—are situated in a balkanized, anti-white and dying America until freedom fighters create an independent White Republic in a corner of the territory. In 2010 I purchased copies of the first four novels of the saga and devoured them with uttermost interest (*The Brigade*, which almost made me cry, contains good advice as to how to conduct a racial war in the 21st century). While I felt uncomfortable that the last pages of *A Mighty Fortress* featured a female director of movies in the newly created Republic, I let it pass because National Socialist Germany also allowed the career of filmmaker Leni Riefenstahl. But Riefenstahl was the exception, not the rule. In NS Germany women were generally not allowed to carry out official functions: they were excluded from positions of responsibility.

In Covington's saga the ethnostate is clearly depicted as a self-styled National Socialist state, even during the revolutionary period before the creation of the Republic (“You a Nazi, sir?” “I am”—page 278 of *The Hill of the Ravens*; “...a lot of us are outright Nazis”—page 74 of *The Brigade*). And I cannot agree more with what Covington said on page 53 of *A Distant Thunder*, “When a race of people loses its women, it loses everything.” (This, incidentally, is what moved me to reproduce a Maxfield Parrish illustration of an ethereal nymph on the cover of this book.) On pages 187-189 of the *Ravens* Covington even enumerates his “Ten Principles of National Socialism,” of which I will mention a few lines:

Be Honest. A National Socialist faces a fact whether he likes it or not. Dishonesty is the mark of the enemy, who has falsified man's conception of life, past and present. National Socialism represents the truth of life in its purest form.

Be Faithful to your Race. No one must be allowed to spoil what nature created in eons of racial evolution. Your highest purpose in life must be: to carry on that evolution toward a better, stronger more beautiful mankind. The purity of the highest race is basic requirement for ever-higher evolution.

Fight for your Race. Fight for the holy ideals of National Socialism, which is the heart of our great race.

Nothing is Impossible. Where there is a will, there is a way. Everything falls before the man of indomitable will. It is necessary for us to suffer many cruel sacrifices because we must harden ourselves for the most decisive struggle in history.

Reject Decadence. Everything must be judged in relation to the survival and improvement of your race. Anything and anyone who hinders either the existence of our race or its perfection must be rooted out and destroyed.

But Covington violated this last principle by playing decadent music in some of his radio podcasts. Furthermore, in his last novel, the only one that I did not purchase (Covington kindly sent me a PDF draft of the first 452 pages of *Freedom's Sons*, which I printed and read), he makes huge concessions to runaway feminism.

On page 13 of the draft he sent me, for example, an order is expressed about the need to keep female soldiers out of direct combat in spite of the fact that Covington's female characters are "as brave as lions." Similarly, page 16 states: "A number of Nationalist soldiers wearing NDF tiger-stripes—mostly female..." On pages 18-19 a feat is described about one of these female tigresses, and on page 38 it is stated that "The new government department consisted of 342 people plus himself, about evenly split between male and female." The most offensive line in *Freedom's Sons* is found on page 50 which contains a dialogue: "A lot of Christians and general Neanderthal male chauvinist type want to go back to an all-male army."

I confess that as a potential revolutionary I used to listen Covington's Radio Free Northwest shows, and loved his urgent plea to invite all conscious whites to move to the Northwest corner in preparation for the civil war. However, when Covington included the voices of a couple of women in his podcasts I lost interest and stopped listening the show.

More than a year passed... Then I learnt that one of these women betrayed Covington. She flipped sides to the point of becoming anti-white, and in her website she even disclosed what happens in some "Secret Nazi Meetings" attended by the supporters of Covington: supporters who had indeed taken the trouble to move to the Northwest in preparation of Covington's civil war.

The Old Man had violated his first principle, "*Be Honest*," because a National Socialist honestly faces the biological fact that women are simply not interchangeable with men and that, in genuine NS, positions of responsibility belong to the Boys Only Club.

* * *

White nationalism is only a stone in the middle of the rapid-flowing waters of a dangerous river; an over-the-water large stone that can help us in our endeavor to jump to the other side. I myself used that flat stone in my crossing from Christianity and Liberalism to National Socialism. (In fact, I could even write down such a spiritual odyssey in a text that might be titled "From St Francis to Himmler.")

But even accepting my metaphor that the stone is not meant to be a permanent residence let me say that, on a very generous estimate, the contents of this book are incomplete. Its

intellectual content must be balanced with another book about what happened before, during and after the Second World War: a book that will detonate an *emotional* bomb in the reader's mind:

Hellstorm: The Death of Nazi Germany, 1944–1947 by Thomas Goodrich (reviewed way above).

Only after assimilating *Hellstorm*, together with the present book, will the reader be purged from all the viruses of the mind with which the murderers of Germany infected his soul.

Parting word

Mars and Hephaestus

by Guillaume Faye

Our century will be a century of iron and storms. It will not resemble those harmonious futures predicted up to the 1970s. It will not be the global village prophesied by Marshall MacLuhan in 1966, or Bill Gates' planetary network, or Francis Fukuyama's end of history: a liberal global civilization directed by a universal state.

The Third Age of European Civilization commences, in a tragic acceleration of the historical process, with the Treaty of Versailles and end of the civil war of 1914-18: the catastrophic twentieth century. Four generations were enough to undo the labor of more than forty. Europe fell victim to its own tragic Prometheanism, its own opening to the world and universalism, oblivious of all ethnic solidarity.

The Fourth Age of European civilization begins today. It will be the Age of rebirth or perdition. The twenty-first century will be for this civilization, the fateful century, the century of life or death.

Let us cultivate the pessimistic optimism of Nietzsche. "There is no more order to conserve; it is necessary to create a new one." Will the beginning of the twenty-first century be difficult? Are all the indicators in the red? So much the better. They predicted the end of history after the collapse of the USSR? We wish to speed its return: thunderous, bellicose, and archaic. Islam resumes its wars of conquest. China and India wish to become superpowers. And so forth. The twenty-first century will be placed under the double sign of Mars, the god of war, and of Hephaestus, the god who forges swords, the master of technology and the chthonic fires. This century will be that of the metamorphic rebirth of Europe, like the Phoenix, or of its disappearance as a historical civilization and its transformation into a cosmopolitan and sterile Luna Park.

The beginning of twenty-first century will be the despairing midnight of the world of which Hölderlin spoke. But it is always darkest before the dawn. Let us prepare our children for war. Let us educate our youth, be it only a minority, as a new aristocracy.

Today we need more than morality. We need hypermorality, the Nietzschean ethics of difficult times. When one defends one's people, i.e., one's own children, one defends the essential. Then one follows the rule of Agamemnon and Leonidas but also of Charles Martel: what prevails is the law of the sword, whose bronze or steel reflects the glare of the sun.

Excerpted from "Mars et Héphaïstos: Le retour de l'histoire" (2007).



Ex gladio libertas